

I look forward to the next trustees' report, which we should receive by next April, as I feel certain that its new estimates will take account of the actual experience occurring since the last report. It should prove most helpful in deciding on appropriate action.

The last few months have demonstrated that social security's basic variables so affect its income and outgo that even with the finest actuarial advice there is a tremendous uncertainty as to what costs are going to be and what social security tax rates will be needed to meet these costs. We have had brought home the fact that in contrast with ordinary insurance and annuities where the annual premium is fixed within narrow limits and actuaries deal principally with mortality, social security requires also the best guess possible of future economic conditions. For these future conditions largely determine the total earnings which will be taxed and hence the System's future contributions, and also greatly affect the size of the rolls and, in the long range, the benefit levels, and hence the expenditures. We need more experience in the actual operations of the 1956 amendments.

The situation I have outlined calls for statesmanship of a high order. As is always the case, there are numerous social-security bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee for liberalizing the System. These were introduced in good faith and possibly may be construed as commitments of their authors. I am deeply appreciative of this situation. I feel that the authors' constituents will appreciate that these bills were introduced on the assumption that the 1956 estimates of receipts over expenditures were correct and that the surplus of receipts over disbursements would make the proposed liberalizations feasible. I cannot believe that public opinion would favor enacting these bills under the present circumstances. I should like to stress this point because the American people are vitally concerned in the soundness of our Social Security System. Would it not be considered a betrayal of our trust if we, at this time of a mounting social-security deficit, recklessly deplete the trust fund by further liberalizing amendments?

The fundamental principle, adopted at the outset of the old-age and survivors insurance system, was that the System should be actuarially sound. The orig-

inal act established what was termed the "old-age reserve account" and which, since the 1939 amendments, has been called the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The principles leading to its establishment and purpose were reaffirmed by the 1956 amendments. In establishing disability insurance at that time we likewise established a separate trust fund, the Federal disability trust fund, separately financed by the additional social-security tax which was imposed and earmarked solely for disability benefits.

There have been, particularly in the early days of social security, divergent views as to the appropriate size of the trust fund, but since 1939 the present general yardstick has been in the law. It contemplates that Congress shall act when the trust fund is unduly small or unduly large. This general yardstick is referred to as the "3-times rule"—the relation of the trust-fund balance to three times the estimated expenditures during any of the ensuing 5 years. There is also the unwritten rule that the System should not operate in the red—the pay-as-you-go rule. I do not believe that this House will ever knowingly act in violation of these rules.

Members of this House are keenly aware that they are, in reality, social-security trustees who represent, on the average, some 400,000 citizens of their respective district, practically all of whom are concerned with this great System as present or prospective, direct or indirect contributors and beneficiaries.

I have included in this 400,000 not only those presently employed and directly contributing toward benefits and those actually receiving benefits, but all, including wives and children whose breadwinners' take-home pay is affected by social-security deductions and whose every purchase is affected by social-security taxes passed on to them by way of higher prices, and who are in turn given a floor of protection by the System.

Each of us is pressed to make changes in the System and each recognizes that many of these changes may be desirable. Each of us appreciates that these proposals must be evaluated in terms of immediate and long-run costs, as such costs must, at least ultimately, be reflected in the social-security taxes. In thus weighing benefits and burdens we exercise a necessary trusteeship.

The Congress has been subjected increasingly to articles in the press which

point out that social security has been liberalized every election year since World War II and cynically forecast that this year will be no exception. We properly resent this inference that social security is considered a political hand-out, irresponsibly provided by the Congress. Every student of the system knows the care and consideration which have been given each change. We have at times differed among ourselves on some details, but we have likewise recognized the integrity of those with whom we differ. Amendments have been adopted only after a careful appraisal of their results, and we have been zealous above all else to preserve the financial integrity of the System.

The fact should be published that each 2 years there is a new House of Representatives, and that social-security proposals introduced the first year are in general the bills whose necessary study and consideration precedes our action in the second year—which is inevitably also an election year. The public should be fully apprised of the careful and considered actions which precede social-security changes.

I particularly stress the importance of a broad understanding of the reasons why the present social-security situation has developed. Members who may be disappointed in not getting action on social-security proposals which they prize, should take satisfaction that inaction demonstrates the falsity of charges that we are playing politics with social security. Much more important, it gives our people concrete evidence that their deep faith in the integrity and security of our contributory insurance system is not misplaced.

I cannot think of anything more tragic, both to the present and future beneficiaries of the System, than our knowingly enacting any proposal that would scrap the principle of pay-as-you-go and operate the System in the red, or which would increase expenditures at a time when the System already is so operating. Such action would undermine public confidence both in the System and in the Congress which controls the System. It is essential that the solvency of the old-age and survivors trust fund be preserved so as to safeguard the benefit rights of the millions of Americans who look to the OASI program for their retirement security. It is particularly essential that such benefit rights be protected with respect to our Nation's low- and middle-income families.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Elder Kenneth R. Pinkstaff, pastor, Metter Primitive Baptist Church, Metter, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Unto the Supreme Architect of the Universe, we lift our voices in prayer. Accept our humble praises for Thy rich mercies and loving kindness that Thou hast bestowed upon us as a great nation. Grant, O merciful God, Thy eternal wisdom and divine understanding shall

be granted here in the leadership of these men that God and this Nation might be blessed. Thou knowest the future, Thou understandest our faults from afar off. Shun us from evil that we may follow in the paths of a Holy God. Endow Thy blessings on all the leaders of our Nation and especially upon the President in the capacity of leadership. It is written that God shall preserve the nation that seeks him. Remember now, our Father, the rank and file of our people and grant Thy benefits in the sustaining qualities of life. May the schools and churches be the guiding

lights of this great country. Bless, O merciful God, the sisterhood of nations and especially the nations that are enemies to the great cause of Christianity. May the shining light of Thy supreme liberty and the glowing radiance of the grace of God be upon us and may the God who is able to keep us from falling, present us faultless before the angelical throne of the eternal heaven, we ask it in Thy great name both now and forevermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE WITH JUSTICE PLAN

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, 40 prominent educators, editors, diplomats, churchmen, and writers, all long experienced in Middle East problems, have called for a peace with justice settlement of the Arab-Israeli controversy lest the strategic Arab world be driven once and for all into the outstretched arms of the Kremlin.

Their proposal is clear and understandable. I believe it to be worthy of very special attention.

The members of the national committee for security and justice who formulated the basis for settling the 10-year-old controversy included Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick; Prof. William Hocking, Harvard; Prof. Philip Hitti, Princeton; Profs. Millar Burrows, John Brubacher, and Marvin Pope, Yale; Prof. Christina P. Harris, Stanford; Prof. H. P. Beck, City College, New York; historian Harry Elmer Barnes; author Alfred M. Lilienthal; editors Father Ralph Gorman, Sign magazine; Father Vincent Kearney, America; William R. Mathews, Arizona Daily Star; W. L. White, Reader's Digest; Dr. Alford Carleton, former president Aleppo College; former Ambassadors Wallace Murray, Harold Minor, and Joseph Green; Mrs. William L. Rogers, chairman, San Francisco Council of Churches; and Mrs. Frank Smith, trustee, American University, Beirut, Lebanon. The plan was recently made public in Dallas, Tex., by Committee Counsel Alfred M. Lilienthal who is on a national lecture tour. The text of the plan follows in full:

MIDDLE EAST PEACE WITH JUSTICE PLAN

November 29 marked the 10th anniversary of the United Nations resolution partitioning Palestine. Since that day in 1947, the Holy Land and the Middle East has experienced continuous bloodshed, turmoil, and warfare. Nearly 1 million Arab refugees face the rigors of their 10th winter in exile, many of them still living in camps subsisting on a United Nations bounty of 7 cents per day.

The sole party to benefit from this tragedy has been the Soviet Union. As this committee publicly warned at its very inception in January 1956: "The Arab world is being driven once and for all into the outstretched arms of the Kremlin."

At the heart of the Middle East tensions lies the unresolved Arab-Israeli controversy. Any settlement of the differences between Israel and the Arab States must be based on the resolutions of the United Nations of which Israel is a creature. The State of Israel has no legal claim to any land beyond what was assigned to her under the 1957 U. N. partition plan. In the year 1957, her occupation of certain territory by force cannot be recognized as constituting a right of possession.

It is our belief that the following constitutes a basis for settling this 10-year-old conflict with justice and with due consideration to the national security of the United States. Israel as the intruder into the area must first agree to these concessions:

1. The surrender of western Galilee and other territory which Israel seized during

the 1948 war. Rectification of the truce lines between Jordan and Israel and the reassignment of lands separated from border villages to whom they belonged at the time of the partition. This latter would involve a minor readjustment but would remove a major obstacle to peace. It is estimated that some 200,000 Arab refugees could be resettled in Galilee.

2. The internationalization of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The new city must be yielded by Israel to international rule. A hundred thousand Arab refugees could be settled in the Jerusalem international zone and its environs.

3. Granting of permission by Israel for the return of 100,000 Arab refugees to live within her borders. Those Arab refugees not falling into any of the above categories would be compensated for their property losses in accordance with past resolutions adopted since 1948 by the United Nations. Any settlement to the refugees must include real and adequate compensation for property losses to be paid to individuals and not simply given in a lump sum as a contribution for the resettlement of these refugees.

4. De-Zionization of Israel—the Israel State must cease attempting to serve as a headquarters and spokesman for world Jewry and must discontinue her practice of encouraging by propaganda the emigration of Jews to Israel. This will require the disavowal of the claim of both Israel on all Jews and of all Jews upon Israel. The expansion of the State of Israel remains the gravest threat to the Arab world and constitutes the principal reason for the disastrous arms race in the area.

5. Granting by Israel of free access to an overland corridor across the Negeb linking the Arabs of Africa (notably Egypt) with the Arabs of Western Asia and availability to Jordan of a free port in Haifa.

Were Israel to agree to such concessions, this would in fact make her the kind of a state the United Nations believed it was decreeing in 1947. The Arabs would have no reason, while not conceding the fact that the historic relationship of Jews to Palestine has no standing in international law, as acts of magnanimity in the face of the exigency of displaced Jews not to agree to the following concessions:

1. Recognition by the Arab States of the State of Israel.

2. Lifting by the Arab States of their trade boycott.

3. Granting by the Arab States of free access for Israel to the Suez Canal.

4. Granting by the Arab States of free access for Israel to the Bay of Aqaba.

5. The internationalization of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The old city must be yielded by Jordan to international rule.

A settlement based upon the above concessions could be enforced by a new United States policy. The United States must adopt a consistent, constructive, and long-range policy for the area as a whole, including a program for economic development. This would entail the end of the special and exceptional position enjoyed by Israel and of past policy based on maintenance of a balance between the State of Israel and on the part of the seven Arab States. The United States through the United Nations would guarantee the final boundaries agreed upon by Israel and the Arab States and would enter into pacts with Israel and the Arab States guaranteeing their security.

LATIN AMERICAN REGIONAL DISARMAMENT PROGRAM

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last night in New York City before the Overseas Press Club, Ambassador Gonzale J. Facio, of Costa Rica, delivered an important speech setting forth constructive suggestions for a Latin American regional disarmament program. Ambassador Facio, who is also the Vice Chairman of the Organization of American States, based his recommendations on the fact that Latin American peace has not been maintained by large armies, but by the development of peaceful machinery for solving disputes.

The Ambassador said:

The Inter-American system has built the most effective peace machinery the world has ever known. The OAS Charter itself reaffirms the principles of collective security and lays the basis for more harmonious inter-American relations.

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, or Rio Treaty, has made it possible to put an end through collective action, to every armed conflict that has arisen in the hemisphere.

As a distinguished Member of the other body stated in commending Ambassador Facio's leadership, Latin America offers an exceptional opportunity for a region breakthrough on disarmament, a breakthrough for which the people of all nations never cease to pray.

SALUTE TO UKRAINIANS ON ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Ukraine, and I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in the House in saluting these gallant people.

On January 22, 1918, the government of Ukraine issued a proclamation of independence. Shortly thereafter, Ukraine was invaded by the Bolsheviks, and was incorporated into the Communist Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Iron Curtain is drawn across the afflicted Ukrainian nation.

Ukraine is a nation of 40 million, the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. For 37 years its people have been enslaved under the iron yoke of communism. They have endured mass murder, wholesale deportations, brutal torture in slave labor camps, the destruction of their churches. Yet they have never abandoned hope of eventual liberation and the reestablishment of their land as a free, sovereign, and independent republic. Ukrainian patriots have engaged in continuous and valiant underground resistance. The fight goes on today to regain their independence and free way of life. The lamp of free-

dom still burns in the hearts of its people. It will not be extinguished and will blaze again, proudly and fiercely when liberation has been won.

This anniversary is an appropriate occasion to make known to the courageous people of Ukraine that we Americans are wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of human freedom, and once again express our determination never to rest until freedom is restored to people now living in Communist captivity.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the many distinguished Americans of Ukrainian descent in observing the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. The largest captive non-Russian nation in eastern Europe, Ukraine today is enslaved by the Communist tyranny but the hope of freedom remains alive. The best evidence of this is the vicious anti-American campaign being waged in the Communist press of the Ukraine.

These proud people are being flooded with lies about discrimination against Ukrainians in the United States in an effort to discredit our Nation as a symbol of freedom. We are proud to have in our midst over 1,500,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent who are loyal, hard-working citizens respected in every form of endeavor. Many are great scientists and educators who have contributed much to American life. They are lending their talents and their skills to making the United States the best hope of freedom in the world.

Communist campaigns against Ukrainian nationalists are grim evidence that the spirit of independence is still alive in eastern Europe. We cannot permit the lies of the new "hate America" campaign to dishearten these brave people who are suffering so much to keep faith with the freedom they once enjoyed.

Our best reply is the respect with which we hold their countrymen who are living among us as fellow Americans dedicated to the preservation of freedom.

COMMEMORATION OF 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, is a day of great importance to Ukrainian Americans. It is of even greater importance to the Ukrainians that live under the domination of Communist imperialism. This day is celebrated each year as one means to hold

forth hope for freedom and independence for these oppressed people.

Former President Hoover has said: "The Ukrainian people became the first victims of the tide of Communist imperialism which subsequently engulfed so many free nations." There has long burned a strong desire on the part of the Ukrainian people to control their own affairs and their own destiny. As a free people with great resources, they are in a splendid position to make many contributions to their fellows throughout the world.

At present, the energies of this gifted people are confined to projects which result in a glorification of the Soviet dictatorship. Moscow is now engaged in a vast propaganda campaign to discredit the free world in the eyes of the Ukrainian people. Ukrainian culture and individualism is being suppressed in an effort to more closely integrate the Ukraine with centralized thinking originated in Moscow. The U. S. S. R. insists that the Ukraine is an independent republic and must therefore have votes in the U. N., but this proclaimed independence is indeed a sham.

I firmly believe that it is necessary to accomplish more at this time than merely call to the attention of the American people commemoration of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, which was destroyed by the Russian Communists in 1920. This is an appropriate time for serious consideration of methods by which the Soviet propaganda campaign can be offset. I am calling upon the United States Information Agency, through its Voice of America and other means to increase its efforts to bring home to the Ukrainian people the truth concerning the free world. It is important that the Ukrainian people see us as we are and not as the Soviet propaganda machine has described us.

Truth is one of the most powerful forces in the world today. It is one weapon that we possess that the Soviets do not. A forceful program of presentation by the United States Information Agency can be one of the greatest steps forward toward insuring that future Ukrainian independence days will be celebrated under freedom rather than tyranny.

NATIONAL SCIENCE COUNCIL

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is again confronted with a critical period in which our institutions and our people are being put to a test—a test to determine whether we measure up to meet the new and greater dangers posed by the Soviet Union.

It is my firm conviction that our Nation and our people can withstand the new challenges. But new steps must be taken, and new direction must be given to some of our existing institutions and their programs.

In accord with this, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 10208, today which would establish a National Science Council. Through adoption of this legislation I sincerely believe striking achievements would be made in coordinating our effort so that the maximum results would be obtained in our scientific and technological research and development programs.

Four years ago, the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the Committee on Government Operations conducted an extensive study of our military research and development programs. It was my privilege to have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations which submitted the 24th Intermediate Report of the Committee on Government Operations, entitled "Organization and Administration of the Military Research and Development Programs—House Report No. 2618, 83d Congress, 2d Session."

The purpose of the committee at that time was to bring to the attention of the Congress and the executive branch of Government the unfavorable conditions existing in our military research and development programs and our recommendations for correcting such situations. It was the belief of our subcommittee in making recommendations that a number of beneficial changes could be achieved through administrative action within the Department of Defense. Other changes necessarily would have been made effective through legislation based on the recommendations of the committee and submitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

In the 4 years that have followed, a few of the recommendations of our committee have been placed into effect. Other recommendations remain only as recommendations; no action has been taken. At least one has met with defeat on the floor of the House: that taking place in the 84th Congress when it was submitted by the President as a reorganization plan.

In this age of advanced technology, when seconds measure miles traveled, and when the sky no longer is the limit, the necessity of a sound research and development program is not even questioned. It was my opinion 4 years ago that a definitive research and development program was most essential to our national defense. Today I am more convinced than ever that a coordinated program of research and development is not only most essential, but is the one course we must follow to prevent what may in the foreseeable future lead to the destruction of our Nation.

Adoption of the recommendations contained in the subcommittee's report—House Report No. 2618, 83d Congress, 2d session—would have placed our Defense Establishment in a superior position. I think we are yet the strongest Nation in the world.

However, the adoption of those recommendations now is not an adequate solution of our problem. Had we acted upon the report issued in July 1954, our Defense Establishment would have been much closer to our ultimate goal than it is today.

We Americans always find a solution to our problems, no matter how insurmountable they may seem at a given moment. We can and we will find a solution to the problem which confronts us in stepping up the pace of our numerous and varied scientific programs.

I am firmly convinced the answer lies in the creation of a National Science Council. Through this approach we would achieve coordination and integration of both policies and programs which are concerned with research and development for our national defense. The programs of the Department of Defense as well as all Federal programs in science and technological research would be favorably affected.

A short time ago the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], introduced legislation which would establish a National Science Council. I have personal and intimate knowledge of the majority leader's keen interest in this field. Because of this interest and because of his patriotic and unswerving interests in our Nation's welfare, he has acquired a vast amount of information on the problems of research and development.

It was a privilege and an honor to have had the present distinguished majority leader participate in the hearings and assist in the preparation of the report on the military research and development program during the 83d Congress.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the report referred to was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee and the full committee.

Today I join with the distinguished majority leader in introduction of a bill providing for the creation of a National Science Council. This bill incorporates the majority leader's recommendations with some additional ones which I feel confident the gentleman will accept. Passage of this proposed legislation will provide our Nation with a program designed to meet the problems of the space age.

NATIONAL SCIENCE COUNCIL—DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Provisions of the bill are briefly outlined in the following:

The National Science Council would consist of five members, appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation. The Council would serve as principal adviser to the President and National Security Council with respect to new developments in the field of science and technology which affect national security. One of its primary tasks would be to more effectively coordinate policies and functions of departments and agencies of the Government relating to programs for research and development.

This legislation would place at the disposal of the President a five-man council in charge of our scientific programs, bringing about a coordination of all projects under one head, thereby eliminating the confusion of a system that has lacked central scientific direction. It would provide the President with an advisory committee which would be able to keep the President informed

on all of our scientific programs, yet be free of the bias of particular agencies or branches of service concerned with such projects.

In addition, the duties of the Council would be:

To establish priorities for carrying out projects for research and development in science and technology; to achieve maximum utilization of the Nation's resources by transferring materials and facilities from agency to agency on a priority basis; to avoid overlapping and duplication of programs by formulating and carrying out such plans; to transfer funds from one program to another and from one agency to another; and to transfer personnel for their most efficient utilization.

Another important function would be the formulation of and placing into operation a plan for collecting, abstracting, analyzing, translating, and disseminating scientific and technical information and data from all sources, including information from foreign nations.

The Council would also be given authority to formulate two other programs, but such programs would not be mandatory and may be placed into effect at the discretion of the Council. One program would be formulation of plans for cooperating with institutions of higher learning to insure that such institutions provide the base of learning necessary to the effective education of scientists and engineers.

The other program would be formulation of a plan for obtaining information and data on research and development from industry, foundations, and institutions of higher learning.

IMPORTANCE OF COORDINATED PROGRAMS

Had this Council been in operation, the confusion of our own satellite programs would not have existed, for this Council would have made a determination as to which organization would have carried on this particular development.

You will recall the reports that a number of Soviet Union magazines last summer contained stories about the sputnik but because of a lack of translation facilities and personnel, these articles went unattended. The Council will carry on a program which will alleviate this difficulty, bringing to the immediate attention important scientific articles translated from a foreign language.

Another step that could be taken by the Council under this legislation might be establishment of a nationwide guidance and aptitude testing program for our schools, or if not establishment of such a program by the Council, cooperation by the Council with whatever agency may establish such a program.

An opportunity to tap other sources for vital knowledge in our sciences is also provided should the Council desire to place into operation a plan for obtaining information from industry, foundations, and universities. Considerable basic research is carried on in these institutions, and the availability of this scientific information could be an invaluable aid to our Nation's security. I want particularly to emphasize at this point that this provision of the bill is aimed at obtaining vital scientific information

from all industry, our large plants as well as the small concerns. Great achievements have been made through industrial research and development, and full utilization of these accomplishments should be made by our Government.

The necessity of this program cannot be minimized. I think the need for legislation such as I am proposing in H. R. 10208 has been amply illustrated in many respects. Soviet Union gains in science and technology have been rapid, as we know only too well when we review the achievements of the Russians in launching two satellites, their development of intercontinental missiles, their extensive and extremely mobile submarine fleet, equipped with the most up-to-date scientific instruments and weapons, and their testing and development of nuclear bombs.

I am convinced establishment of a National Science Council will provide us with a major solution to one of our most disturbing problems, that of achieving coordination and integration of our varied programs in research and development which so vitally affect our national security.

The value of this program in scientific achievement cannot be measured other than to say it will bring outstanding gains for our country. But the value in savings can be measured in the dollars we will not spend for costly duplication of programs. I think the money we will save in creating this Council to coordinate our scientific efforts will be tremendous. One of the Council's activities most certainly will be directed to coordinating basic research activities so that duplication will be eliminated. Under proper direction, I believe savings of millions of dollars will be possible through establishment of a National Science Council.

Today we are confronted with a menace that grows ever stronger as the Soviet Union continues to pour the major share of its resources into the development of a powerful war machine. To meet the challenge we cannot continue our present system of operation. We must make new approaches which are designed to realize the utmost in development of our vast resources.

One such new approach is contained in the bill which I have introduced today. I believe this legislation in establishing a National Science Council can be instrumental in furthering our scientific programs to a point where we will no longer need worry about Russian technological achievements. Eventually, the Science Council can be adapted to play a leading role in the President's proposed program of science for peace.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to revise and extend his remarks and include a table and extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. TABER and to include a letter.

Mr. ANFUSO, Mr. ZELENSKY, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. ROONEY.

Mr. FARSTEIN.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. REUSS in two instances.

Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. CRETELLA.

Mr. KEATING.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 5 hours,

the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself. However, I hope we can finish the debate on the bill today.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this measure, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Balley	Dingell	Morrison
Barden	Eberhart	Moulder
Barrett	Fallon	Norrell
Bass, Tenn.	Farbstein	O'Neill
Becher	Granahan	Passman
Blitch	Grant	Pillion
Boland	Green, Pa.	Powell
Bow	Gubser	Radwan
Breeding	Halleck	Reed
Brownson	Herlong	Rhodes, Pa.
Buckley	Hillings	Schwengel
Budge	Hollifield	Scott, N. C.
Carnahan	Holland	Scott, Pa.
Celler	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Christopher	Kelly	Spence
Coudert	Lennon	Staggers
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Talle
Dawson, Utah	McGregor	Ullman
Denton	Macdonald	Williams, N. Y.
Dies	Morrow	Zelenko
Diggs	Moore	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10146, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, last year when we considered the Department of Defense appropriation bill the May sun was blazing down on the Capitol and we hoped that the prospects for the future were bright. Today the atmosphere is heavy and dark, and we meet amid encircling gloom. But I am not superstitious, and I refuse to believe that there is any ill omen in the weather.

Last year a majority of the Members of the House followed the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee in cutting the Defense budget by about \$2½ billion. We will not argue now about the correctness of the figure. The

cut in funds was a bold and determined action by the House designed to accomplish at least in part a number of things, including the following:

First. More unification among the services—compelling more unification by reducing the dollars and making closer cooperation in various programs and in the organizational setup imperative.

Second. A reduction in the huge carry-over in unobligated defense funds at the end of the fiscal year. The total availability of money for the Defense Department in the previous year had been \$74.4 billion and the estimated unobligated carryover on June 30, 1957, was \$10.8 billion. It was agreed that a large carryover under the present system was necessary, but a gigantic unobligated carryover in the sum of \$11 billion was considered as excessive, and we took steps to reduce it.

Third. A reduction in certain requested funds which, if granted, would result in overfinancing many programs and in an invitation to bad management and waste. As one example, and there were many others, we cut about one-half billion dollars out of the Army request for production and procurement funds. Despite our reduction, there is still an excess of funds in the account.

As an overall proposition, we made reductions in many areas for the announced purpose of compelling better procurement practices, better management, and more economy in the field of money and manpower. We did not think it unwise or improper for Congress, which has the power of the purse, to try to use this power in an effort to get a more effective defense program and more value for the defense dollar.

Today the Russian sputnik is orbiting the earth and there is a sense of apprehension in the air. In that atmosphere we are struck straight in the face now with this question. Did we hinder the defense program last year in reducing the defense budget? The positive and unequivocal answer to this question is, no, we did not. It is unmistakably clear and now undisputed from any responsible source that last year Congress gave the Department of Defense several hundred million dollars more than is being used for this year's operation. The amount as given by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNeil, is \$899 million. This is made clear in the hearings on the bill, pages 315 and 329.

There has been a dramatic change in the world picture since last October when the Soviet space satellites were launched. Our intelligence people have become aware of a previous miscalculation of Soviet progress in satellites and long-range ballistic missiles. They have revised their estimates of Soviet capability in these desperately important fields. They have concluded that the danger to this country is definitely greater than was surmised by them at the time Congress passed the defense bill last year.

Mistakes are made from time to time, and had we been in error, we could in good faith and logic now take note of the miscalculation of our military and civilian advisers and try quickly to repair

the unintended damage to our defense program by making hasty deficiency defense appropriations now.

The report on the bill clearly shows that the Defense Department is not asking for the restoration of one single dollar of the cuts made in the bill last year. The money which is provided in this bill is for new programs which have never heretofore been presented to Congress for funding.

It has developed that in the defense appropriations bill of last year, Congress gave the Department of Defense large sums of money which are excess to the needs for the program presented last year. One of the explanations for this is the spending ceiling which was imposed by the Bureau of the Budget which slowed down spending and retarded many programs.

For the purpose of making the point clear, I would like to analyze briefly the aircraft and related procurement appropriation of the Air Force of last year. On July 1, 1957, there was a total carryover of unexpended funds in this account in the sum of \$11.3 billion. In new funds we provided in the bill last year for this account \$5,886,000,000, making a total availability for the year of \$17.2 billion. The budget request for new money in this account last year was cut by Congress in the sum of \$314 million.

Most of this cut was assigned by Congress to excessive spare parts. There was assigned by the House a cut of \$75 million to the nonballistic missile program. We pointed out in the report and on the floor that the IRBM and the ICBM had the highest priority and that the program should be pursued vigorously without any money restrictions.

On May 24 last year, in discussing the Defense appropriations bill, I said:

We even cut missiles a bit, but nobody is going to suffer greatly because we nicked this program about \$75 million.

The cut was not in the ballistic missile program. It was not in the IRBM or the ICBM program. We made that point very clear in the House and in the committee report. I quote the following from the committee report, page 77:

None of the reduction is to apply to the ballistic missile program.

With respect to the ballistic missile program, I made the following statement in the House debate on May 24:

Particularly in the field of ballistic missiles, the sky is the limit—and I say this for all to hear—from the standpoint of the committee and the Congress—the sky is the limit in this most highly competitive field now between the Soviet Union and the United States, and that is in the ballistic missile area.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to question the chairman of this very important committee because since the Congress adjourned last year many people, Members of the House and outside of the Congress, have been accused since the advent of sputnik of having been responsible for our present lack of facilities

and preparedness because we voted for cuts.

Mr. MAHON. I can yield my friend some time in general debate.

Mr. WIER. I was just going to ask the question. This is the question: I was among those who were accused of voting for that cut, which I did, and that I was not acting in the best interest of the country.

Mr. MAHON. The cuts by Congress did not retard the defense program. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. WIER. Among others who were questioned about the cuts was Charley Wilson, former Secretary of Defense, and I remember definitely the news services calling attention to Charley Wilson's answer to that and his having cut the defense appropriation. I remember the answer that Charley Wilson gave and that was that he was not responsible, but the responsibility lay in the White House where a later cut was made in these necessary appropriations. Is that true?

Mr. MAHON. The committee report on the pending bill and what I have heretofore said in these remarks make it clear that the reduction by Congress of the defense budget last year did not in any way retard or impair our defense program. A ceiling was imposed on defense spending by the Bureau of the Budget, but I do not want to get into that matter at the moment.

What I have heretofore said is only a part of the defense picture. Let us go back to 1946 when this country first began to think about a long-range ballistic missile. This was the beginning of the study stage. In the days of these early studies there was no general feeling of urgency because United States military strength at the end of World War II was vastly superior to the Soviet Union. In post-World War II days, we concentrated more on the shorter range nonballistic missiles, missiles designed to stop fighter and bomber aircraft which were then the major threat to this country.

In hindsight, long-range ballistic missile studies were not pursued with sufficient energy; first, because by reason of our vastly superior strength, there was no apparent need of urgency, and second, because prior to 1953 or early 1954, our military people were told by the technological experts that an ICBM or IRBM with an atomic warhead would be so big, heavy, and unwieldy that it would not be feasible. Sufficient thrust could not be provided to carry such a large and heavy warhead to the target. The long-range bomber was considered more trustworthy, more accurate and dependable. And to produce an ICBM or IRBM that did not have an effective atomic warhead was regarded as the height of folly.

The first hydrogen bomb was detonated in November 1952. The test was successful, but several months were required for full evaluation. The significant moment had come. The feasibility of the smaller warhead for the long-range ballistic missile was established during 1953, or by early 1954, as a result of the hydrogen bomb.

A lot of progress was made during those earlier years in ordinary nonballistic guided missiles. But not until 1953 did research in ICBM possibilities, which had been proceeding for some years, reach the breakthrough stage. We can be thankful that this was accomplished as soon as it was because it has given us an opportunity to avert disaster.

If one is bent on fault finding, there may be enough blame to go around when we look back. For a certainty, when we look forward there is enough glory to go around if we measure up to the responsibilities of the hour, make the right decisions, make them promptly, and get going with the necessary programs. In summary, it is fair to say that during the 12-year period of 1946 to 1958 far less than a perfect job has been done in the ballistic-missile field.

I personally am not interested in trying to dissect our blunders or in political maneuvering. There is no place for politics in this picture; indeed, the best thing politically and the best thing for the country is for us honestly to face the future and get on with the job. Some are afraid we do not have time to catch up in the critical areas where we are lagging. I do not share that philosophy. I am no defeatist. I think we can get the job done. I refuse to entertain any other thought.

A further fact needs to be made clear. Despite the mistakes of the past this country has made great progress—not as much as could have been made, but much progress. As Americans we have stumbled but by no means have we fallen on our faces. Neither our own people nor our friends and enemies overseas should underrate our progress to date. It has been substantial. But we must move much faster. We must unfetter science and industry and the people in the Government who work on the operating levels in the defense program.

I wish to say frankly, and I have said this before, that after visiting in recent weeks many laboratories, defense plants, and installations generally from coast to coast, and conferring with the people of industry and listening to the testimony of the people in the operating levels in the services, I am encouraged over the spirit I find. I am encouraged to believe that we can meet the challenge to our security. We can do it if we will make prompt and sufficiently bold decisions and apply our best energy to the job. Some of the essential decisions have been made. Many others have not been made. They must be made and without delay. Decisions are pending now.

There is no room for encouragement and hope if we are to follow the practices of "business as usual." There is still some of that attitude in the defense picture, but not as much as there was before—not as much as there was as late as last November when the defense subcommittee made a tour of vital defense plants and consulted with defense officials here at the Capitol.

Mr. McElroy, the new Secretary of Defense, is making a fine impression in his contacts with Members of Congress and Congressional committees. He is new at

the job, of course, and cannot be expected to instantaneously get a full grasp of all our defense programs and problems. He made a fine impression when he appeared last November and again a few days ago before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. We told him in our hearings, and I said today, that we must and we shall give this man our best cooperation in his effort to lead the gigantic defense effort of our country.

Another thing that has encouraged me recently has been the statement by the President in his state of the Union message in which he indicated that he was going to do something about eliminating some of the chaos which presently exists in the Department of Defense organization. I do not quote his words, but the general idea was that there is much room for improvement and that he planned to make the defense programs more effective. And when he spoke a couple of nights ago in Chicago, he said this:

A prompt and effective modernization of the Defense Department is necessary.

At that point he departed from the text of his speech and said:

In this I intend to participate personally until the job is done.

That was a very encouraging statement.

Certainly I feel that the Congress will want to do everything it can to encourage the President to get into this picture actively in order to get maximum results during these decisive weeks that lie ahead.

The House of Representatives today or tomorrow could make terrific headlines across the Nation and throughout the world, perhaps, if we would reject this supplemental appropriation as an inadequate approach to our problems. We could add hundreds of millions of dollars for more B-52's, more ICBM's, more money for the Polaris submarine program, more money for space weapons generally. Yes, we could get a headline which would read "The House grabs the ball from the Commander in Chief and runs with it." Well, it is my judgment that we will have time to revise drastically defense budgets later in this session if we determine that it will be wise to do so.

The request in this case was that we give this money and give it quickly. In an effort to cooperate, we arranged for the hearings on the bill to start before the actual request for funds was received from the budget. We have provided all the funds requested by the President and certain additional latitude.

For us to take the time to go into other fields and discover other requirements would take weeks. We might be successful in our hunt, but if we did that we would lose the objective of this bill. This bill is no good without quick action, because this bill is nothing but a series of programs and projects lifted out of the 1959 budget and advanced to the 1958 budget in order that we may get going sooner. So it would therefore be most unwise, it seems to me, not to follow the recommendation of the Committee

on Appropriations in this situation. In the regular bill, which comes a little later, if we are not satisfied, we can then work our will. But let us give the Commander in Chief and the new Secretary of Defense a little more time to make additional recommendations to Congress and let us have time to look over the 1959 budget and see what it really is. That will be best for defense.

Mr. Chairman, if we should load this bill down with additional hundreds of millions of dollars, what will be the result? It will mean that at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1958, the Department of Defense, instead of having \$8 billion in unobligated funds will have a much larger carryover of unobligated funds, this would represent a further lack of control of the purse by Congress.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The point that the gentleman from Texas is making is that this supplemental request is for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to buy some time on some very vital programs.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is exactly right. And the way to buy time is to move with haste.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wanted to ask a question. I think I clearly understood the gentleman to say this. Is it the purpose of this appropriation bill to maintain the supplementary defense program as presented by the Secretary of Defense without increasing the bill or diminishing the bill? Is that the gentleman's judgment and the judgment of the committee?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The point is, let us give the new Secretary what he has asked for. Let us give him a chance to take the ball and run with it. I think he is entitled to our cooperation. The request which he has made is most conservative.

What is in this bill? The purpose of this bill is to accelerate the Strategic Air Command program for making our forces more alert. If you are going to have a B-52 ready to take off with 15 minutes of warning you have to have certain construction. Along the runways there have to be little arteries of concrete whereby each plane can come onto the main runway and takeoff in a hurry. Also, you have to have living quarters for the crews near by.

Another thing the bill does is to disperse our Strategic Air Command into more bases and areas where it would be more secure against attack, where we do not have so many of our eggs in the same basket.

Another interesting thing is the money which is provided in this bill for the early detection of the intercontinental ballistic missile. We have no way of knocking down such a missile at this time if we are confronted with it. We do not even have any way to detect it. Our DEW line, our radar screen, is not

capable of detecting an intercontinental ballistic missile. Those missiles go up to a very high altitude and if we have the right kind of equipment we can detect them in the earlier phase of flight. If we have the right equipment we may be able to detect the flight of the missile. We also have studies designed to perfect ways of intercepting these missiles. First, we have to be able to detect the approach. We have provided for a few installations which will enable us to do that. This will be a very expensive program. Further large sums will be required.

Another thing that is provided here is a speedup of the ballistic-missile program for attainment of operational missiles. We provide funds for the supporting hardware.

In the report we say, in effect, "We wish you would take some of these surplus funds you have on hand and will not need during the fiscal year 1958 and apply them to expediting the Titan program. That is the follow-on intercontinental ballistic-missile program in which we are now engaged."

We provide funds here for three Polaris submarines. These are submarines that will be able to fire intermediate range ballistic missiles from under water. This is a tremendous step forward in modern defense. It is a program that has the unqualified support, insofar as I know, of all our military people, of all the services, and certainly of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. From the hearings it is my understanding that the Navy Department stated that they might come in at a later date during this session with a supplemental request for an additional six Polaris submarines. If that supplemental request is submitted by the Navy Department, would it be a proper statement that the Committee on Appropriations will give it urgent consideration?

Mr. MAHON. Certainly the committee would give it early and urgent consideration. I know the gentleman appeared before the committee and asked us to put more Polaris submarines in this bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. The Secretary of the Navy said if he found it feasible after more exploration and research on this subject he would ask for more submarines. I am sure that his request would receive the support and cooperation of the Congress.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I am happy to see you have approved the program for the three Polaris missile submarines. Is there anything in this bill that would provide for a defense against a Russian submarine or any other submarine that might approach our shores with that kind of Polaris-firing submarine?

Mr. MAHON. This bill is restricted in scope. It represents an effort to expedite the programs I have described. In the last year's defense appropriation bill a lot of money for submarine warfare and various devices calculated to meet this problem were included. I think the gentleman can be sure that there is no lack of funds for that particular purpose at this time. We will certainly provide additional funds in the big bill which will come on later in the year.

Now, we are being asked to provide for the transfer of \$100 million in funds in the Defense Department, to the emergency fund, in order that in the event of a sudden breakthrough the President and Secretary of Defense could quickly channel that money into that field, so that no time would be lost. We have agreed to that transfer of \$100 million to the emergency fund. We provided a total of \$135 million for the emergency fund at the last session.

In this bill is money for the Advance Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense, which was authorized by the House a short time ago. I do not know whether this new approach will work or not. Certainly the objectives are meritorious. We have not undertaken to deny the Secretary of Defense the opportunity to try this method in order to get quicker action and more money for the defense dollar.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief summary of the bill. I wish to commend to you the reading of the report on the bill, which is very clear and contains, better than I have been able to state, just what this bill does.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. It is true that while this bill is described as a supplemental bill, it is not, in the strict sense of the word, a supplemental bill at all, because it does not deal with any item to restore or to increase the appropriation that was made in the last year's bill. In other words, what we are doing is simply taking the first page out of the 1959 appropriation and making it applicable to 1958.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Every one of these items would no doubt have appeared in the budget for 1959.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. All we are trying to do is to gain time and buy time by making this money available between now and July?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct and I appreciate his clarification of the issue.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. The gentleman knows what profound respect I have for him in his field. We may interpret a given set of facts differently, we may differ in judgment on evaluating a situation, as we did last year. I voted against the defense appropriation cuts.

I well knew that much of the money was and is being wasted. But the way to eliminate it is through better organization and better men. Correct the system; but in an era of danger such as this, it is better to be safe than sorry.

I have a couple of questions I would like to ask. The enemy capability is the bull's eye in preparing defenses. Does the enemy have a stockpile of 800-mile range missiles capable of carrying a war-head?

Mr. MAHON. There are many people who believe that the enemy does have an operational intermediate-range ballistic missile, one that would fire within the area of 700 to 800 miles. I am afraid that is true. Naturally it jeopardizes our forces overseas.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Well, now, in a way it could jeopardize our own security.

Mr. MAHON. Anything that jeopardizes our men or our friends overseas jeopardizes us.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Yes. And the continental United States, too.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; it jeopardizes the continental United States in that way.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Does the enemy have a missile-launching device for submarines?

Mr. MAHON. I feel confident that the enemy does have a missile-launching device for submarines, but we cannot go completely into the intelligence picture on the floor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman means does Russia have missile-launching submarines that can be guided, the answer is "Yes."

If the gentleman means ballistic missiles, the answer is "No."

Mr. MAHON. I think that is the best estimate of the situation. We have, and we think the Soviets have, submarines that will launch missiles. I am not speaking of the ballistic missiles.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Does the gentleman feel, from the intelligence reports, that they are developing and perfecting guided-missile-launching apparatus for submarines?

Mr. MAHON. It would seem to be beyond the realm of possibility that they were not working very hard in this new field, a field which we are working on. As already stated, we believe the Soviets now have submarines with non-ballistic-missile-launching capabilities. So do we. The Russians, we think, do not have submarines that will launch ballistic missiles; neither do we. The Russians are probably engaged in a program for ballistic-launching submarines; so are we.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. One other question: Do qualified persons believe that an antimissile missile is practical?

Mr. MAHON. Of course if you ask the scientists and the military people you find that they are never on the pessimistic side; they feel that they can make the antimissile missile. The Army unofficially indicated last November that it would like to have a \$6 billion program for perfecting the anti-intercontinental

ballistic missile. We have been working on anti-intercontinental ballistic missile possibilities for a number of years.

But let me express this thought. Our enemies have never been able to stop all American attack aircraft; they were not able to do it in the Korean war; they were not able to do it in World War II. We never have thought we could stop all enemy aircraft that might attack us. If we cannot stop substantially all enemy aircraft how can we expect very quickly to work out a device for stopping with a considerable degree of reliability an intercontinental ballistic missile which has soared 800 miles above the earth and is coming toward us at a speed of 15,000 miles an hour? This is no small problem. But we are working on it. I think however that while we are working on it we may be forced to conclude that in this field perhaps a good offense is better than the type of limited defense that might be within the realm of capability in the near future.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Is it not true, that, for these very reasons, the Rockefeller report and Dr. Edward Teller have been saying that we should not overlook a shelter program to protect from fallout?

Mr. MAHON. I think they probably suggested we go into a shelter-building program, but that is the kind of thing we should take up in the regular bill, not in this supplemental bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman not feel that in the case where there is any considerable doubt as to whether the enemy is operating with any particular weapon, that the only safe course to pursue is to adopt the assumption that they do have it?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri is eminently correct.

There is no doubt in my mind whatever, and I have heard days and weeks and years of testimony in this military field, that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in the field of ballistic missiles. Those who wish to argue that we are ahead will agree, I think, that we should proceed as though we were behind; and I think it well to point out that this country can no longer afford the luxury of miscalculating and underestimating from year to year the strength of the potential enemy.

This is a time of great urgency and potential danger and if there is any doubt about the requirement of a program for the defense and the survival of this country, we should resolve that doubt in favor of security and get on with the defense program which appears desirable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 43 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill

(H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the special orders for today will be transferred until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE LAWRENCE H. SMITH

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that I have to make a very heartbreaking announcement. It is one of these occasions when you wish you were not compelled to do so and I know that every Member of this House feels the same as I do.

At 12:20 today LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH, United States Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, passed away as a result of a heart attack. He collapsed on his way to the House restaurant for lunch so that he could be on the floor of the House for the day's session and program. He immediately became unconscious and never regained consciousness.

The State, the Nation, and the world all mourn the passing of a great statesman. He was a great statesman. I doubt whether there ever sat in the halls of Congress a man who exemplified as much courage, integrity, sincerity, and industry as did LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH. In the estimation of all the Members he was an ideal statesman in every respect. I doubt whether a Member ever sat in this Chamber who had the unanimous respect and admiration of each and every one of his colleagues, no matter on what side of the aisle they might be seated.

Although many times he did not agree with the majority, those who did not agree with him had nothing but the highest admiration and respect for his opinions and his judgment. He was one of those who could disagree most vehemently without being disagreeable. His opposition generated admiration and respect—never hate and condemnation. If there was anyone who had any doubt, and I do not think there was, about his sincerity and his integrity, that doubt was ultimately resolved in favor of LAWRENCE SMITH.

The way he died is typical of his great statesmanship. He died working for his country. He was warned by most of his colleagues to take things easier. But the crisis of the times impelled him to work harder than ever. Our Nation and the world can ill afford to lose him. But

our Nation and the world are much better off because he lived and served.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, these events that happen so suddenly make it most difficult for us to express in words the feeling that is in our hearts.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a man who was dedicated to the welfare and wellbeing of his country. He was a gentleman at all times, he was a statesman at all times, a man of firm convictions and unyielding as long as he felt his position was right and for the best interests of his country. I have lost a very close friend and adviser, the State of Wisconsin has lost one of its greatest statesmen and native sons.

We all mourn his passing and extend our very deepest sympathy to his wonderful wife, Eleanor, and to his children. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the Wisconsin delegation and other friends in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH. For many years it was my privilege to enjoy his friendship. I knew what a great patriotic American he was and the patriotism that he brought into his work. He was a devoted man, dedicated to the service of Wisconsin and to the country. We will all miss him. We will miss his cheerful smile, his friendly handclasp. We might have our differences of opinion, but that did not affect LARRY SMITH. LARRY SMITH was a man of real strong convictions and possessed the courage to fight for those convictions. He always gave his best for the country. No man can do more. To his good wife, who has won the admiration of all through her grand patriotic services, and to his family may I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, there are moments when personal sorrow is so deep that words are inadequate to express it. I came to Congress 7½ years ago, and from the moment that I came through the door LAWRENCE SMITH has been at my right hand with counsel, breathing encouragement in moments of frustration, always giving me his cheer, always reminding me that the best that a man or a woman can give here is none too good for a great country.

LAWRENCE SMITH's district is just to the north of mine, and there is so much crossing over the Illinois-Wisconsin border, north to south and south to north, that we have sometimes felt that we served almost the same district. We have served districts which shared the same convictions; districts which demanded of us that we stand by those convictions. I know of no one in the Congress, during the 22 years that it has been my privilege to know it, who has so

strongly stood for what he believed as did LAWRENCE SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, after his first heart attack, which was a serious one, there were many of his friends who urged him time and time again not to give so much of himself. There were moments when we tried to dissuade him from taking the floor to speak for a stand not too popular but one in which he believed with all his heart, but on every such occasion LAWRENCE SMITH said, "What good would I be here if I did not give all of myself that I could?"

So, today, we share the grief of his widow, who has given so much of herself to Washington, and of his family, who, like his friends, respected LAWRENCE SMITH as much as they loved him. I know of no one who has ever come to the Congress in the history of the United States who showed more courage, who stood more strongly by his convictions, and who felt so fully that even his life was not too much to give to his country.

The Congress will be a lonely place without him.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing away of our esteemed colleague, the late Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH, of Racine, came as a deep shock to me as it has, I am certain, to all of the Members of this body. It was a tragic occurrence, and I would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow and his family.

The late Congressman SMITH was the dean of our Wisconsin delegation in the United States House of Representatives. I had the privilege of serving with him in the House since my first election to Congress, and I respected him particularly for his sincerity and his staunch integrity. He was a fine gentleman, always courteous and considerate of the people who came in contact with him. We shall miss him greatly, and so will, I am certain, the people of his district who elected him as their Representative to nine consecutive Congresses.

Through our common assignment to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I enjoyed close association with LARRY SMITH for the past 9 years. While we differed frequently in principle, I admired him for his conscientious devotion to his legislative duties, for his diligent questioning of witnesses who appeared before the committee, and for his adherence to policies which he considered to be in the best interest of our entire Nation.

There was nothing petty or egocentric in LARRY SMITH's discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to him by his constituency. He was firm in his convictions, courageous in their defense and modest at all times. He was a worthy opponent of those who disagreed with him, yet he was a steadfast friend. He had the respect and affection of many Members on both sides of the aisle.

My wife joins me in extending our sincere condolences to his widow, Eleanor, and to his family. May they find consolation in their bereavement in the

thought that the good Lord shall number him among His very own. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues from Wisconsin in grieving the sudden passing of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH. LARRY, as we fondly called him, was a dedicated man. He had certain principles in which he firmly believed and he fought for those principles. He respected those who did not agree with him and he had their respect.

I remember that from the time I came to Congress I counseled with LAWRENCE SMITH. He did a great deal for me, and I greatly appreciated it. I know of no individual from Wisconsin who has served in the Congress who has done more to create harmony in Wisconsin than did LAWRENCE SMITH.

His passing is deeply felt not only by his colleagues here, but the people of his district know they have lost a conscientious legislator.

To his beloved wife and his family Mrs. Withrow and I extend our sincere sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a staggering loss to all of us, and especially to me personally. LARRY SMITH came here to the Congress about 2 years after I did. We have been close friends ever since, associated in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

LARRY SMITH served his country gallantly in war and just as gallantly in peace. He was a great student, a man who had profound, firm, and unswerving convictions, but a man who was always gentle and courteous and who never did a mean thing to anybody.

He and I differed often in our votes on matters in our committee, although many times we were together. But I think those who served on the committee would join me in saying that his was always a constructive approach. Time and again criticisms which he made resulted in better legislation. Time and again amendments he offered resulted in better legislation.

His sense of service was so unswerving that, as has already been said, at the time he first had this serious type of illness, which was a premonition of what was to come, there were many of us who said to him that the time had come for him to take it easy. But he felt that here was his duty, and he not only continued to serve in Congress but he did not swerve or save himself in the exacting work of his committee and in the exhausting work of this floor. So he has gone down fighting a good fight.

To his dear wife, Eleanor, and to his children goes the sympathy of all of us. May they receive the blessed comfort promised by our Lord to those who mourn.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin has lost its most outstanding citizen in the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH, chairman of the Wisconsin Congressional delegation. Members of our House delegation had learned to lean on LARRY for advice and counsel.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a great American. He was a fine Christian gentleman.

This noon as I sat in the House restaurant LARRY and his longtime friend, Del Kenny, of West Bend, entered the restaurant. I got to him as soon as possible. His attack was a great shock. I had been with him at dinner last night and he was in good spirits as we visited with Wisconsin friends.

As a new Member of Congress in 1953, LAWRENCE SMITH, as dean of our delegation, spent many hours with me. He was patient, he was helpful. There is no one that has given me more help and sound advice here in Washington than LAWRENCE SMITH.

LARRY had a fine career. He will long be remembered by the citizens of Wisconsin and America as a true conservative.

LARRY was State commander of the American Legion. He has contributed much to civic and community life in Wisconsin. He gave much to help his community, to help his State, and to his Nation here as a Member of Congress. This Congress has suffered a great loss today. Our State of Wisconsin and our Nation will miss LAWRENCE.

Certainly from our entire delegation goes deepest sympathy to the members of his family and his dear wife, Eleanor.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to speak when one's heart is overfull, yet each of us, I am sure, is impelled to record here our sorrow at his going, our gratitude that LARRY SMITH has lived.

I came to the Hill in the 76th Congress—our deeply loved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, joined us in the 77th. Since then we have sat side by side in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, exchanging ideas, arguing our points of view, quietly and earnestly. His comments as we listened to the witnesses and to the discussions were often amusing, always gentle, always kind.

After his first severe illness it became apparent that LARRY was giving his life, bit by bit, to his country. Today the last bit of strength came to an end, and we are left shocked and grieved that he has really gone. Yet will we always be grateful for his living—for his presence among us—for his gentle smile, his quiet wisdom, his indomitable courage, his unswerving faith.

LAWRENCE SMITH was one of the Members of this House who began his day with prayer, who set himself straight with his God before he took up the burdens of the day. To him God has been an ever-present, ever-accessible reality, of whom he could ask clarity, understanding, courage at any moment, as the need came upon him.

LARRY and I talked often of life with a big L; the miraculous adventure of

living that we are privileged to experience. I believe he felt as the eastern sage expressed it, that—

Never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never;

Never was time it was not, end and beginning are dreams;

Birthless and deathless and ageless remaineth the spirit forever

Dead though the house of it seems.

Surely this man with whom we have worked and played, this consecrated patriot, this rare spirit who has been among us, has but stepped across the threshold to a fuller, freer life of larger opportunity and greater beauty.

To Eleanor, his companion and his wife, I would extend my understanding and affectionate sympathy, knowing that she will be upheld by her own staunch faith and her certainty that there can be no separation when a love such as theirs holds them close.

For us all, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we pray together in our hearts James Martineau's beautiful prayer:

We seem to have given him back to thee, dear God, who gavest him to us. Yet, as Thou didst not lose him in the giving, so we have not lost him by his return. Now as the world giveth, givest Thou, O Lover of Souls! What Thou givest, Thou takest not away. For what is Thine is ours always, for we are Thine. And life is eternal; and love is immortal; and earth is only a horizon; and a horizon is nothing save the limit of our sight. Lift us up, strong Son of God, that we may see further; cleanse our eyes that we may see more clearly; draw us closer to Thyself, that we may know ourselves nearer to our beloved who are with Thee. Prepare us for that happy place that where they are and Thou art, we may be. Amen.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the greatest shocks that I have suffered in a long time. In fact it is very difficult for me to say what I wish to say in regard to LAWRENCE SMITH.

I rode up in the elevator with him this noon. I followed him into the dining room. I saw him go over to a small table on the right. I thought, "I believe I will go over and sit with LAWRENCE." As he reached for the chair to sit down, he fell forward on his face, striking the table, and the blood flowed from his nose. He lay there on his back. I wiped the blood from his nose. I felt for his pulse while someone was sending for the doctor. I could feel the slightest flicker of a pulse and I thought then the end had come.

This is getting to be a very serious matter in the House of Representatives. We can so ill afford to lose men like LAWRENCE SMITH. Yes, he was dedicated to many things. There was one thing he believed in. I know he believed in the Holy Bible. I know he believed that he some day would go to another world. I know that he believed in our Constitution as much as he believed in the Holy Scriptures. He practiced his beliefs here on this floor. His life is going to make a great contribution to this country, because I have always believed that every man is some boy's ideal. He may not know who the boy is, but he forms an opinion and he wants to grow up and be

just like that man. That is a wonderful responsibility. Many youths I am sure in his Congressional district and elsewhere who have known LAWRENCE SMITH will want to grow up to be the type of man he was. How rich a heritage that would be for the United States of America, if every man so lived that he would be some boy's ideal—an ideal to make that boy a finer citizen.

There is so much I would like to say in regard to LAWRENCE SMITH. Our thinking ran along the same channel as far as foreign affairs is concerned, and in many other respects.

Mrs. Reed joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith, her children, relatives, friends, and the Wisconsin delegation.

I feel so deeply for his dear wife and his children. My sympathy goes out to them. God bless them. I believe that many of his friends on the other side were waiting for him to come.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. TEWES].

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, the dean of our delegation has gone. The suddenness of his passing has left all of us with a numbness and a sense of shock.

Our relationship was warm, personal, and cordial despite the contrast of our positions, for he was Wisconsin's senior Representative and I its junior. Perhaps this gave us a special bond.

Our acquaintanceship predated my election to Congress. He was helpful to me in reaching a decision when I first was urged to be a candidate in 1956. Then he aided me during the course of my campaign. Finally he gave cheerfully of his valuable time to introduce me to my new responsibilities here in the Halls of Congress.

LARRY SMITH had the respect of all, whether they agreed or disagreed with him. He was firm in his convictions but gentle in the conflicts which resulted from them. On those occasions when our decisions brought us in opposition, I never felt from him any malice or any disrespect. I, in turn, held him in the greatest esteem for the integrity of his beliefs.

These moments here in the well of the House he loved so much are a rare tribute to LARRY SMITH. He left us but a few moments ago and already this body is conscious of its loss. Here men from all walks of life, from all parts of the country, and of all philosophical beliefs are rising to speak the feeling and regret which has hushed the House.

From Mrs. Tewes and myself I offer our deepest sympathy to Eleanor, his constant companion and helpmate, and to his family.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has only been within the last 3 years since I have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee that I have come to know LARRY SMITH intimately. Many times he and I were on opposite sides of the question before the committee.

I would go further than the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr.

O'KONSKI] when he said LARRY SMITH could disagree without being disagreeable; I found that he could disagree with me and elicit my admiration. He could disagree with one in such a way that one felt the strength of his convictions shining through and at the same time the warmth of his character and personality, and one felt that although he disagreed, he was still a friend. Many times after committee meetings I have discussed the issue with him and I came to know him better each time and to have deep sense of admiration and respect for him. He filled a great need as a balance wheel on the committee because he gave his viewpoint in such way that those who disagreed with him could at least look long and respectfully at the point of view he presented.

His friends will miss him, Congress will miss him. I did not have the privilege of knowing his wife and his family, but to them goes my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the sudden death of LAWRENCE SMITH, dean of the Wisconsin delegation. I knew LARRY for many years. I first met him some years before I came here when he and I debated one night before an audience in his native Racine County. At that time I learned to know what has since been brought home to me more and more, that here was a man of great earnestness, and sincerity, and goodness. He was a gentleman.

Since then he has paid me hundreds of little kindnesses. Just the other day when I discussed a point of foreign policy with him and wanted to explore it more fully, he took the trouble to write out his thoughts and bring them to my office to study in order to get the benefit of his thinking. I am going to treasure that last note I received from him the more.

If we in this body can follow the example of LAWRENCE SMITH for fairness, sincerity, gentleness, and goodness, we need have no fear for the future of this, the greatest of legislative bodies.

To his beloved wife Eleanor and his fine family go my deepest sympathies. We are going to miss LAWRENCE SMITH.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am doubly shocked at the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH because my wife and I were present in the dining room when this tragedy occurred.

Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Representative LAWRENCE SMITH today is a severe shock. A veteran of 17 years here he had the confidence of his constituents in the First District of Wisconsin.

I came to know him as a freshman Representative from the Ninth District of Wisconsin who came to Congress, like he did, as the result of a special election. Although we came from different political parties I always found LAWRENCE SMITH to be a gentleman who was generous and courteous in his discussions of

political matters. No person ever questioned the sincerity of his viewpoints which always were precisely and accurately expressed. His devotion to duty is well known here on Capitol Hill where he started his day early and worked late in behalf of those who sent him here. I sincerely mourn his death and know that the Wisconsin delegation has been saddened by his loss. Mrs. Johnson and I shall miss him greatly. Our sympathies go out to his wife Eleanor and his children.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, none of us know normally how we are attracted to various Members of this distinguished body. I have served here over 17 years and LAWRENCE served here for at least that length of time. I do not remember just when our friendship began, but, being an early riser I know that each morning at 8 o'clock LAWRENCE SMITH, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and myself open up the cafeteria. It was not infrequent that we all occupied the same table for breakfast.

This morning two of us were there, LAWRENCE SMITH and myself, but later we were joined by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. We enjoyed a very pleasant breakfast. He did not appear to be ill. We discussed the budget, we discussed the state of the national debt, and, as it would happen, we discussed the raising of the public debt. I told him I was going to vote for it. He said he was not. We did not question each other's integrity. Of course, I did not question his. I asked him why? He said, "That would be my way of protesting against spending and that is my reason for voting against it. We are spending too much money."

But, as many of you have observed, never did he make one feel badly or cause one uneasiness because of his disagreement. He was a million percent American gentleman. Here I am from the Deep South, he from the Middle Northwest, and friends for many years.

LAWRENCE SMITH visited me in Charleston, my hometown. We offered our guest house in the spring of the year when our flowers beckon so many people from so many sections of America. Last spring he visited us and I was hopeful he would again this year.

LAWRENCE and his wife were two of the most charming people one could meet. He made many friends in my part of the world and, for that matter, wherever he went. As head of the subcommittee on real estate of the Committee on Armed Services, I worked with him very closely, and he worked tirelessly for the initiation and construction of a tactical airbase in his district, the Bong Airbase. He worked all the time, and it was such a great pleasure to work with him. But, this morning as he sat

there he did not think and I did not think that, as the poet said:

But such a tide as moving seems asleep;
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the bound-
less deep
Turns again home.

We will miss him. He will leave a void here. We will all remember him. He has returned home with the soundless tide to the boundless deep.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our distinguished colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, has shocked all of us. His is the most recent of the passing of several of our distinguished Members, and that should bring to all of us the serious thought of what pressures the Members of the Congress are under. It should cause us to pause for a moment and realize that it is well for all of us to give our best, as LARRY did, to the task that has been assigned to us by our constituents and to the responsibility we have as Members of this great body, to the care and the protection of all the people of our country. LARRY was a living example of one who devoted himself to the nth degree in discharging his great responsibilities, and as was so well said by some of our colleagues a few minutes ago, he gave his life for what he thought was best for all of our people.

I have been privileged to have known LARRY SMITH and his good wife over a period of many years. To know LARRY was to love him. He was a man dedicated to the nth degree to his responsibilities. There is so much that could be said of the fine example he gave to all of us by his actions. He was studious and knew the subjects that he was to speak about and, as was said, he was never offensive but, rather, he stood firm in expounding his beliefs. That is true Americanism. It can well be said of him: This world is better because LAWRENCE SMITH lived.

My prayer is that the good Lord will give strength to his devoted wife and to his family to bear this great burden that has been thrust upon them and He will have mercy on his soul.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, to some of us who have just returned from the funeral of one of our other distinguished friends, Mr. Andresen, of Minnesota, the passing of Mr. SMITH illustrates that all of us stand more or less a heart-beat between this life and eternity.

Things that have been said about LARRY SMITH have been so true and so sincere. LARRY came to the 77th Congress at a special election, and I have known and admired and respected him all of these years. LARRY, I think, more or less illustrates something that is so necessary in this country, of people who believe in principles and who sustain those principles no matter how few or how great the allies may be. With it all he had the noble gentleness of a fine Christian gentleman. I suppose there

could be many things said, such as his deep devotion to his country and to his district, and that when you lose people like August Andresen and LARRY SMITH it is a long time before you can replace them in their respective districts and in the Halls of Congress.

To Mrs. Smith, to his family, to his district and the State of Wisconsin I extend my deepest sympathy. May eternal light and justice, the kind of justice that LARRY SMITH wanted in this country, be his forever.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, within all too short a number of days we again have a colleague who has answered the last call. The knock came to the door of life for LARRY SMITH unexpectedly today. It impresses upon all of us that we live such lives as to be ready for that knock when it comes our way. LARRY SMITH lived such a life.

Many, many fine words have been spoken this afternoon about the life of LARRY SMITH, about the devotion of this man to his duties. They are all true. But yet words can never really express what LARRY SMITH really stood for—his accomplishments, his hopes, his ambitions, and his contribution to all of us. In my official capacity as party whip, knowing of LARRY's strong convictions, on many occasions I have sat down with him, he quietly but firmly explained his position on some issue. Of course, to try to change a man who had such honest convictions would be foolhardy. He very plainly and forcefully set forth his deep-seated convictions on the issue at hand. He forcefully presented the reasons why he felt he was doing the right thing for his district and the people of this great country. I admired him for it. I admired him for his convictions.

Many times people in my district have said, "How can you get along with people who so violently differ with you?" And I said that if there was one thing that I have learned in public life, it is to respect and honor anyone who differs with you and differs with you out of sincere convictions. With such individuals we will never quarrel, however wide our opinions or views.

At his request a couple of years ago, I was privileged to go to his district to make a speech. Unfortunately, he could not be there that night. As I left there I said to my wife, "There is something very wonderful here this evening. After the meeting one after another of those who were present came up to me and in no uncertain terms—almost in an explosive way—they told me of their love and their respect for this man who was their servant in the Congress of the United States." He looked upon them as their servant. They looked upon him as the leader.

I know of no better way to know actually what a man is than how he is regarded by his people at home, where daily he has to deal with people he represents and has close personal contact with them.

LARRY SMITH was a great American. LARRY SMITH was honorable in the full-

est sense. He was honest, upright, and straightforward. He did his job. To it he applied his energy and talents. He gave his life in a continuing effort to solve the problems that constantly arise in the country. I recall the verses of an old hymn which may be familiar to you. It begins:

Are you willing, are you ready? says the Master.

I am sure that LARRY SMITH was ready. My deep sympathy for his lovely wife, Eleanor, and his family. Yes; they will miss him, but they must know there are countless others who, with us, will miss him, too.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the life and deeds of the Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH will shine through the mists of centuries a glowing tribute to a great patriot. LARRY SMITH had the courage of his convictions. He always strived to do the right as God gave him the power to see the right.

My office is only a short distance down the corridor from LARRY's. I visited with him often and many times after hours. LARRY was a hard worker. Saturdays he would be at his office. At night you would often see the light burning in LARRY's office, and with him was his devoted wife. She was always at his side, helping in every way to carry on the good fight which LARRY constantly waged for his beloved country's welfare.

We have lost a great statesman. I have lost a great, good friend. America has lost one of the most sincere, one of the most devoted, one of the most valuable servants who has ever graced the floor of Congress. LARRY SMITH was indeed one of God's noblemen. I grieve with his wife and family. God rest his soul.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened by the sudden passing today of our beloved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, with whom it has been my honor and privilege to serve in this House and on the Foreign Affairs Committee for so many years.

LARRY SMITH, as we affectionately referred to him, was first elected to the 77th Congress in a special election in August 1941. He joined the Foreign Affairs Committee in the 79th Congress and has served with great distinction as one of the outstanding leaders on the committee. LARRY SMITH was a man of the highest integrity who stood firmly by his principles. He was consistent in his views and won the respect, admiration, and affection of all who knew him, regardless of whether or not they agreed with his position on legislative matters. When taking the opposition, he was always an honorable opponent and far from engendering bitterness his tactics and friendly opposition served always to cement old friendships and ever win new friends for him.

In the passing of LARRY SMITH the Congress has lost an outstanding leader

and a very great man, one who was not afraid to fight for what he believed right even when he knew that his vote would not be on the prevailing side. Our country needs more men like him. He will be missed by countless friends all over the country and our heartfelt condolences and sympathy go out to his bereaved loved ones.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to describe the shock and grief which I personally feel on the passing of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH, of the First District of Wisconsin. Ever since I came to the Congress, about 5 years ago and as a freshman served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it has been my good fortune and privilege to be closely associated with LARRY SMITH. We collaborated many times on certain pieces of legislation about which we both had strong ideas. During that period of collaboration and friendship I grew not only to know him but to admire him; indeed, in many respects, to have a deep fondness for him.

I will miss him very much. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will miss him very much. The Congress of the United States will miss him very much. The people of his own district of Wisconsin, the people of that State, indeed, the people of this country will miss him very much. In many respects he has left a vacancy that is difficult, if not impossible, to fill. His integrity, his courage, his firmness in doing what he believed to be right in the best interests of our Government are qualities that sometimes are difficult to come by these days in the degree to which they were found in the person of LARRY SMITH.

Mrs. Bentley and I certainly want to extend our deepest sympathy and condolences to his wonderful wife and family and the people of his district. I express the hope that those of us who remain behind can recall the lessons that he left for us to follow during the 17 years in which he served in this House of Representatives.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT].

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed sad news to learn of the passing of our colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH. I did not believe that I could take the floor to join in the tributes of my colleagues, but in sitting here with you listening to those tributes to a great husband, a fine father, and a true friend of mine, it has been the spiritual lift that I needed.

In the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH I have suffered a deep personal loss. When I arrived in Washington in 1950 as a Member of this distinguished body he was a veteran of nearly 10 years of service in this House. His friendship, counsel and advice was invaluable to me as a newcomer as I know it was to many other Members of Congress.

In all of his activities LAWRENCE SMITH was a man of great personal dignity and charm but to most of his friends he was always affectionately addressed as "LARRY." He was always willing and

anxious to help, and I turned to him many times in the years I have been in Congress. Everyone in Wisconsin knew him to be a hard fighter for what he considered to be right and in the best interests of the people, but he had no enemies. He was respected by supporters and opponents alike. His numerous election campaigns were always conducted on a high level, and he had the confidence of thousands.

To me LAWRENCE SMITH was the perfect gentleman, and he so conducted himself both here on the floor of the House and in his private life. I greatly admired his courage and judgment in public affairs and I know that this Nation is a better place to live because he lived and unselfishly served the country he loved.

He was a native of my home State of Wisconsin and was educated in Wisconsin schools and colleges. He early demonstrated his patriotism by serving as a first lieutenant in the famed 32d Division during World War I. He came to Washington in 1941, following a special election and served continuously since that time. During most of his years of service he was a member of the important House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the work of that committee he devoted himself vigorously to the task of solving some of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation. He also gave of himself unstintingly as a member and department commander of the Wisconsin division, American Legion.

When he experienced a severe heart attack several years ago many of his friends urged him to lighten his burdens but he regarded himself as a good soldier and expendable in the service of his country. He will be greatly missed in this Chamber and by his devoted family. To Mrs. Smith and their three children I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, three times in just a few days the angel of death has gathered in a Member of this House. Our hearts are so full that our tongues are almost silent.

LARRY SMITH was a good man. He was a Christian man. Yes, as has been described, he was a courageous man. He was courageous because of his unalterable faith, not only his faith in this great Republic, but above all his faith in Eternal God.

LARRY will not answer any more roll-calls on the floor of this House but he will be with us. He will be with us forever in our memories, and he will live on forever, through his children.

His life has not ended. His real life, his better life, has just begun, because truly LARRY SMITH was a good and faithful servant who shall have his just reward.

Mrs. Scrivner joins me in extending to Eleanor and the children our heartfelt sympathy, knowing full well that we cannot lessen the loss or lighten the road, but knowing that she will be sustained by the same unfaltering trust in that same

Master of all men that sustained LARRY throughout all of his days.

Beautiful life is that whose span
Is spent in duty to God and man,
Beautiful calm when the course is run,
Beautiful twilight at set of sun,
Beautiful death with life well done.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am joined with my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber in the shock and great grief that have come to us. Only a few days ago LARRY SMITH and I with Mrs. Smith and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] were guests of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] at a luncheon honoring a visiting Minister of the Government of Uganda. LARRY SMITH was so full of life, so vibrant in his interest in the subjects discussed in our conversations, so sweet and charming as ever he was even when differing with you on questions under consideration, that the furthest thought from my mind was that he was on the eve of his departure from us. The House has lost a Member so beloved by everyone that there was no one on either side of the aisle who was not his friend. He will be missed, but he will be remembered as long as any who had the good fortune of being his colleague is left.

In the Committee on Foreign Affairs there will be a void of which we will be sensitive when next we meet and on every later occasion. In the shock of this moment I cannot try to contemplate the conference table in the room of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the chair from which radiated the sweetness and the charm of LARRY SMITH vacant.

In every sense he was a great American. That is a term that we so often use but applied to LARRY SMITH it is truly and accurately descriptive. He may not have agreed with others of his colleagues, but he never quarreled with them. He could debate with eloquence and with great force; but there was never any anger, any question of the integrity of another mind that was not in agreement with his own mind. He was always a gentleman. He was always a devoted public servant and he was a friend with all the warm attributes of a sincere Christian character.

To his wife Eleanor and to his children go my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the Wisconsin delegation in their sorrow over the loss of our good friend and distinguished colleague, LARRY SMITH. Here was a man of so many good qualities that it would not be possible even to enumerate them. He was kind, he was humble, he was courageous, he was dedicated, he was able. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH was a great Congressman. He was articulate and forceful. This House can ill afford to lose men who present their points of view with such clarity and with such conviction as

LAWRENCE SMITH was always able to present his points of view on the important problems which came to us from the great Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It seems to me that representative government thrives on the competition of ideas. The viewpoint which LAWRENCE SMITH represented in the field of foreign affairs was not the viewpoint that generally prevailed in this House in recent years, but it was a very important and worthy approach to our problems in the field of diplomacy. It may well be that his position on these issues, if it had prevailed, would have brought us closer to the goal of peace to which we all aspire than the programs which have had more popular support in this body. LAWRENCE SMITH was a leader. He was the most eloquent and articulate spokesman of the viewpoint which he represented in this Congress. We have lost a truly great statesman.

I extend his wife and children my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a sturdy oak has fallen. The grim reaper has taken my good friend LAWRENCE SMITH. He passed this way and left his footprints in the sands of time. We are better men and women because he walked among us. It is a privilege to have known him.

There have been four deaths among Members of Congress this session. The terrific strain on our Members is really taking its toll. Let this again be a warning to all of us to slow down before it is too late; and may we be ready when the Master calls.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a great American; he was a tireless worker who never let his constituents down. Not in the best of health, he bravely carried on in spite of his physical handicaps. He was a devoted public servant who will be greatly missed by all who really knew him. LAWRENCE SMITH served well his day and generation. What more can be said of any man?

Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his devoted wife and the members of his family.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible for some of us to realize that LAWRENCE SMITH is gone. In the words of the poet I think we would say, rather, that "he is not dead, he is just away."

Mr. Speaker, other Members have mentioned the many noble characteristics that LAWRENCE SMITH possessed. Those of us who knew him well, admired him and worked with him around the committee table would most certainly share those views.

The things that impressed me most about him was the fact that his actions were based upon firm philosophies and beliefs—beliefs that were a part of his very fiber, and he was guided by them; whether they were popular or unpopular with most men.

He did what he thought he ought to do. He presented his point of view in a gentle, friendly but forceful manner.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a great Representative. He had a fine war record. He was a distinguished citizen.

We shall miss him and we pray God to bless LARRY SMITH and to comfort his wife and children in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, in the 15 years that I have been in this House, I remember no period when death has paid us visits more frequent or more costly than in the last 3 months.

The sudden death of LAWRENCE SMITH has robbed me of a warm friend. He and his wife, my wife and I were all in Beirut together in 1953, and we returned home together. He was a most considerate and charming companion. One might disagree with LAWRENCE but no one could question his sincerity or gainsay his patriotism. Duty, I am sure, was the watchword of his life. He lived for the performance of his duties here.

Some years ago LAWRENCE was stricken and within a week I asked him solicitously about his health. He made me a most reassuring reply. I hoped that we might be colleagues in this Chamber for many years to come.

All of us suffer a great loss when men like LAWRENCE leave us. For all of us the bell has tolled.

To LAWRENCE's wife and his children, I offer my especial and most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy today and words are utterly inadequate to express my feelings. I was inexpressibly shocked and saddened when I came to the House Chamber today and learned about the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH. I wish to join my colleagues from Wisconsin and others who have paid tribute to this great American.

LAWRENCE SMITH and I came to this House in the same Congress. I came a few months ahead of him, as LARRY was elected in a special election in the summer of 1941, and took his seat in September.

I remember my first conversation with LAWRENCE SMITH, which was on the floor of this House.

He made a deep impression upon me and I immediately recognized his sterling qualities. My admiration and esteem for him has grown over the years. We formed a close friendship which has meant a great deal to me, and his untimely passing is a great personal loss.

LAWRENCE SMITH was truly a Christian gentleman and statesman. I have never seen a more devoted and consecrated Christian. He believed in God and in his church. He was a man of great faith and he lived his religion. I never heard him speak ill of anyone.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH is an irreparable loss not only to this body but to his district and the

entire Nation. We cannot afford to lose men like LARRY SMITH. We shall not see his like again.

I respected LARRY SMITH for his great courage. He was a man of principle and fought for what he believed. I recall that he had deep-seated convictions concerning certain aspects of our foreign policy, and was always able to support his position with facts and figures. He did a great deal of research work. His speeches on the floor, and his insertions in the RECORD, always contained information of great value.

I am going to miss LARRY SMITH and the House will not be the same without him. His life will always be an inspiration and a challenge to me.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Eleanor and the children. May God comfort them and give them strength to bear this heavy loss, which all of us share with them.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock and sorrow that I learned of the sudden passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Perhaps the achievements of a man during his lifetime constitute the best possible eulogy. If that is true, any words of mine can only be superfluous because the life of LARRY SMITH was an inspiration to all who knew him.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I became intimately associated with LARRY SMITH. Frequently I was unable to share his views but never did I question his sincerity or the depth of his convictions.

He was gentle, but firm—unspectacular, but sound; one who at all times was dedicated to causes he believed to be right and in the best interest of our Nation.

The House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member. I have lost a close personal friend.

May God's blessings be upon his devoted wife and their children during this tragic hour.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of tributes here today to Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH is the measure of the esteem and respect and the affection in which he was held by his colleagues.

As a younger Member of Congress who was not privileged to serve on the same committee with him, I am taking this time to join in these tributes because his friendship was one of the treasured inheritances which I received from my distinguished and beloved predecessor and LARRY SMITH's good friend, the late Congressman Paul Shafer. Curiously, my coming to this House coincided with the time of LAWRENCE SMITH's earlier critical illness.

It was a privilege to have known him. He did me the high honor of accepting an invitation last year to speak in Kalamazoo, Mich., in my district, and in that address he brilliantly and eloquently ex-

pressed his views on current issues, his adherence to constitutional principles and the faith that was in him. As a younger Member of Congress, I can only express the hope, sharing as I do so many views that he held, that I may in some measure match the courage of his adherence to those views and match the tolerance, respect, and kindness which he always exhibited to those who might differ with him.

Mrs. Johansen joins me in extending deepest sympathies to Mrs. Smith, to his children, to his colleagues from the State of Wisconsin, and to the citizens of his district who, with the State and Nation, have suffered a heavy loss.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, like so many who have spoken today, have lost a friend. Many fine things have been said about LARRY SMITH here, and they are so richly deserved. He was, in the fullest meaning of the word, a gentleman. LARRY yielded to no one in his devotion to those things which he felt honestly were good for this Nation of ours, and he was eloquent in his expressions of them. LARRY leaves a proud record here of services to his district, his State, and to the Nation. To me that is a legacy beyond price to those he left behind. Mrs. Horan and I wish to join in sending our deepest sympathies to his beloved wife, Eleanor, and his children.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, like so many others here today I rise at this time with a very heavy heart. It has been my privilege throughout more than 15 years to serve in this body with many men and women. Among them were many of outstanding ability and prominence; but I can say that none exceeded our late friend, LAWRENCE SMITH, in either ability or prominence. He was indeed a man among men. He merited and had the respect of every Member of this House throughout his long career.

In my early days here LAWRENCE and I became good friends. It was a friendship that I cherished and it grew year by year. His charming wife is a very close friend of my family. I doubt that Mrs. Abernethy has a closer friend among the wives of the Members than she has in Mrs. Smith.

Several Members have mentioned the fact that they had different views from those of LARRY SMITH on matters that came before us from time to time. I am in another category. It was not often that LARRY and I differed. He and I almost always saw the issues alike. In fact, many times I have stepped across the aisle and counseled with him on pending issues. He has done the same with me and I always felt honored when a man of such great ability did so.

LARRY was loyal to his political party. But with him the party was always made secondary to his Americanism. He was an American first, a party man second. If he had a choice to make between his politics and his country he always chose his country. I admired him for it. This

House admired him for it and the words that have been spoken on this heart-rending occasion indicate very clearly that his colleagues not only admired him but they respected him.

LARRY SMITH was of the old school. Unfortunately for the country, they are a passing group. Their sound logic, reasoning, judgment, and statesmanship are sorely needed again. No foundation ever crumbled under them. In fact, it was his kind that built the strong foundation on which our country rests. We can ill afford to lose him.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a strong constitutionalist. He was a man of deep dedication and profound conviction. He was dependable. When you learned where he stood today, you knew where he would be tomorrow.

Another great quality I appreciated in our departed friend was his nonsectionalism. He loved this country, all parts of it, all States, all sections, and all peoples. He never once said or did anything that would be offensive to people of other sections.

I am one of those who very frequently met him in the Capitol in the early morning hours. As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] said a moment ago, LARRY was really one of the early risers and late workers. On several occasions I accused LARRY and his wife, Eleanor, who was always with him, of opening the Capitol every morning. I seldom have I come down that he was not already here. I enjoyed my association with him at the breakfast table to which the gentleman from South Carolina referred.

He worked faithfully and he worked hard. In fact he worked too hard, and because he did, I have no doubt but that is the reason he is not here at this hour.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a deeply religious man. His faith was deeply rooted in the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. The deeply consecrated man that he was, if he could speak to us at this hour his words would be something like those of the poet who said:

If but one message I may leave behind,
One single word of courage for my kind,
It would be this—Oh, brother, sister, friend,
Whatever life may bring, what God may send,
No matter whether clouds lift soon or late,
Take heart and wait.

Despair may tangle darkly at your feet,
Your faith be dimmed, and hope, once cool
and sweet,

Be lost; but suddenly above a hill,
A heavenly lamp, set on a heavenly sill
Will shine for you and point the way to go,
How well I know.

For I have waited through the dark, and I
Have seen a star rise in the blackest sky
Repeatedly—It has not failed me yet.
And I have learned God never will forget
To light His lamp. If we but wait for it,
It will be lit.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of my friend and our colleague and I join with the fine delegation from Wisconsin and the other Members of this body in expressing deep sympathy to his fine family and particularly to his lovely, adorable wife.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I learned to know LAWRENCE SMITH best as a very able member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and as a devout member of our regular Thursday morning prayer group. My heart would be heavier if I departed from these Halls today without sharing with you my own sorrow over his sudden and tragic passing.

There is little I can add to the splendid words so eloquently spoken here today as a tribute to him and expressing our mutual sorrow over his passing. My thoughts and prayers go out for his devoted widow and other loved ones in this their hour of bereavement.

As many of you have been speaking this afternoon, there suddenly returned to me the words of a poem I learned as a child—I hope I can recall them—words, the substance of which, the heart and soul of LARRY SMITH may well be uttering at this moment, words so descriptive of his life. The poem is entitled "Gethsemane":

It seemeth such a little way to me across to
that strange country, the beyond,
And yet, not so strange, for it has grown to
be the home of those of whom I am
so fond.

They make it seem familiar and most dear,
And journeying friends bring distant regions
near.

So close it lies that when my sight is clear,
I think I almost see the gleaming strand.
I know I feel those who have gone from here
Come near enough sometime to my hand;
I often think but for our veiled eyes
We should find heaven right around about us
lies.

I cannot make it seem a day to dread
When from this dear earth
We shall journey out to that still dearer
country of the dead,
And join the lost ones so long dreamed about.
I love this world, yet shall I love to go
And meet the friends who wait for me, I
know.

I never stand above a bier and see the seal
of death set on some well-loved face,
But that I think, once more to welcome me,
When I shall cross the intervene's space, be-
tween this land and that one over
there,

Once more to make the strange beyond seem
fair

And so for me 'tis no sting to death.
For grave has lost its victory. It is but cross-
ing with a bated breath, white-set face,
a little strip of sea,

To find the loved ones waiting on the shore,
more beautiful, more precious then
e'er before.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and deeply grieved by the death of LAWRENCE SMITH. Without question, the Congress has lost one of its finest Members, and I know I have lost a good friend.

LARRY SMITH, as many of us knew him, was a man of unquestioned integrity, of courage, and loyalty to his God and his country. Once convinced of the course he must pursue in public affairs he was unswerving. Never, in the time it was my privilege to serve with him in this House, did he yield to the blandishments of expediency.

He was a devoted husband and father; a fearless and dedicated public servant.

He could leave to his family no richer heritage, and he could leave to the people of his district and his friends in Congress nothing in memory that could be more enduring.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending to Eleanor, his widow and constant companion, and their children, our heartfelt sympathy in their hours of deepest sorrow.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late LAWRENCE SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH was a good and kindly man. If you knew him you liked him.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and all who loved him.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, LARRY SMITH was my friend and to call him a friend was a privilege indeed. To him, the service in the Congress was more than a job or a position, it was a responsibility of the highest order.

By his very attitude, he imparted to his colleagues and constituents alike a sense of confidence and dependability.

Not only was LARRY SMITH a highly respected Member, he was also able to combine this quality with that of likeability. The regard prevailed on both sides of the aisle.

The Nation has lost a valuable public servant. Our sympathy is extended to the surviving members of his family in their grief.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I learned today of the death of our beloved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH. To know him was to like him. Many today have mentioned his many kindnesses, his gentle nature, his firmness. He lent dignity and strength to this great legislative body. He ably represented not only his district but, as a great American, made this House of Representatives a greater legislative body.

His memory will be cherished by all of us in this Chamber. Mrs. Marshall and myself express our sympathy to his family.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the 3 years I have served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I learned to admire and respect our late colleague, Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH.

He was a man gentle in nature, but one who always had the courage of his convictions.

The death of LAWRENCE SMITH is a great loss to the committee on which he served, to the Congress, and to our Nation.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and to the members of his family.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, LARRY SMITH and I came to Congress at about the same time. We had mutual friends in Wisconsin so when he first came I looked him up. We have been close friends over the years that we have served together. I feel a great sense of

loss in his passing. I know of no one in the House that was held in higher respect than LARRY SMITH. He had, it seems to me, a perfect concept of devoted duty to his job. While we did not always agree on legislation it never showed in the slightest in our friendship. He was absolutely perfect that way yet he steadfastly and courageously and emphatically stated his views on the floor of the House.

I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith and his family.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult indeed to put into words the sorrow I feel at the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH or how great is the loss to this Nation. Yet his deeds, his words live on in the minds of those of us so privileged to know him. I shared breakfast with him frequently and often benefited from his viewpoints and his counsel. Even now, I study pamphlets and speeches he gave to me, the most recent being the Confessions of a Bureaucrat by Potomac.

LAWRENCE and I were on the losing sides of many votes in this House, and our bond of friendship was strengthened by a kinship of outlook. We shared companion views on the role of Federal Government in our lives. Perhaps my most sincere and heartfelt compliment and commemoration will be to do whatever I can to preserve this old-fashioned traditional view of constitutional government which LAWRENCE SMITH so consistently championed. Finally, if one test of success is to have made the world a little better by having been here, then LAWRENCE SMITH was a great success.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, is a source of real sorrow, and I extend my sincere sympathy to his loved ones in the great loss they have sustained.

In his Congressional duties, Representative SMITH, as a member of the Wisconsin bar, found his legal training of invaluable aid to him in his legislative activities and in his membership on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was thorough in all his undertakings, applying his fine talents to the maximum in analyzing all issues. A constant and unrelenting foe of world communism, our departed colleague had at all times an all-consuming love for his country and was a militant exponent of the American ideals of liberty and freedom. So imbued was he with the obligations of his oath of office and so intense was his desire to serve his country and his constituents with vigilance and devotion that he labored zealously with the myriad of present-day problems, unmindful of his own health. It is proper to conclude that such devotion to duty was a contributing factor to his sudden collapse while engaged in carrying out his Congressional duties on the floor of the House.

Representative LAWRENCE SMITH served with distinction as a first lieutenant, Infantry, 32d Division, during World War I. From the time of his discharge from military service, he became active in veterans' affairs. He was honored by the American Legion in being elected department commander of Wisconsin

and later served as national executive committeeman and national child-welfare chairman, American Legion. The veteran population of this Nation had a staunch friend in Congress in Representative LAWRENCE SMITH as he never missed the opportunity to be of service to the men and women of America who had worn the military uniform. He had added inspiration for his service to veterans from the fact that his beloved wife, Eleanor Rowley Smith, enjoyed the distinction of serving as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, an honor in which her husband shared her pardonable pride.

Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss the companionship of Representative LAWRENCE SMITH. From a personal standpoint, I regard his death as a great loss because he embodied all the characteristics of an able and sincere legislator who had the best interests of his country at heart.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I still cannot believe that LARRY SMITH is gone. His kindness to me and his counsel during my Congressional service were invaluable. He was easily one of the most outstanding Members of this body and his leadership in the field of foreign affairs will be sorely missed by all Americans.

My heart is too full to speak further at this time except to say, Thank God for giving us men like LARRY SMITH.

I extend my profound sympathy to his family and his constituents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden, tragic death of our colleague, LARRY SMITH, brings home to us again for the fourth time in a few short days how transitory is our presence here; impresses us with the fact that the hold, the influence of each of us has no permanency.

Since coming here in January of 1935, 23 years ago, I recall the services of no man which have been of more help to me personally than were those of our colleague.

On foreign affairs, the amount of and the manner in which our money was expended abroad, he was a never-failing source of accurate information. Always his counsel pointed the true way toward the greater welfare of our own people, the manner in which our own national security could best be achieved.

Upon his counsel, many of us—perhaps it might be said, all of us—who did not at all times agree with the foreign policy of previous administrations, relied without question.

Nor was his help limited to matters legislative. Always in the contacts which we had with him was a personal element dominated by charity and by friendliness.

Those of us who remain, whether the time be short or long, will not forget the services which he rendered, not only to our country but to each of us.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH is dead. Never again will his sincere, honest, and courageous voice be heard in this Chamber, pleading for the things in which he believed and the principles for which he stood.

While his voice, one of the most courageous in all the Congress, no longer will be heard, the example of his diligence, integrity, and fearlessness will live on here as an inspiration to all of us who remain and to new Congressmen who come in future years to carry on the great work of this Congress of free men.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a man of great ability and unmatched courage who lived every minute of every day for the welfare of the country he loved and the people he served so faithfully and well. His district, his State, his Nation, and this Congress, of which he was for 17 years a Member, all are better because of his life and his deeds. He was admired by all who knew him for his courage and integrity, and loved for the warmth and kindness of his personality.

Mrs. Mack joins me in extending sympathy to his widow, Eleanor, and his family in their great loss.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The House of Representatives and the people of this country have suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of our good friend, LAWRENCE SMITH.

I have known LAWRENCE SMITH rather intimately since he first came to the House of Representatives. He was one of the outstanding legislators in the United States Congress. He was a real student with respect to legislation upon which he was expected to pass his judgment. Although many times he was in the minority, he did not waiver nor give excuses for his position on legislative matters. He always voted in the best interest of his country as he saw it. Sometimes he was in the minority, sometimes in the majority, but, in any event, his statesmanship rose above political interests.

LARRY SMITH was a kind of man who held no ill feeling against anyone. He believed that every Member of the House was entitled to his own opinion. He also felt the best interests of America were at stake. LAWRENCE SMITH was industrious. He was sincere. He was diligent. He was capable. He was devoted to his task. He was devoted to his country, and above all, he was devoted to his family. He was a real Christian. He lived life to the full. A heart weakness had menaced him for years; he ordered his life by its dictates—but still went his calm, cheer-spreading way. In the end it struck him down, but he was ready for the blow—gallant in bearing, with no regrets, no fears—his unflinching spirit sustained by this reflection:

I know the night is drawing nigh,
The clouds hang low o'er hill and bay;
The autumn leaves are dewless dry—
But I have had my day.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH was one of the greatest Americans and finest gentlemen who ever served in this House.

His tragic passing in the prime of life has left us stunned and deeply grieved.

Like the brave soldier he was, Doc SMITH died at his post of duty. His passing was like the falling of a great oak in the forest resounding throughout the stricken Capitol, his district and State and throughout the Nation.

It was the poet Goethe who said "Courage is the greatest quality of the

human heart; without it thou wert better never born."

The Nation needs more leaders today with the courage of Congressman SMITH. It is said of him that he was a man of strong convictions and that is true. He was also a man of infinite trust in God and unswerving devotion to his beloved country. He fought with unceasing vigor even at the expense of his health for the political principles, moral ideals and spiritual truths he so tenaciously embraced, and he lived to see many of his prophecies and fears come to pass in the shape of developments in the international scene.

Doc SMITH was beloved, respected and admired for his character, integrity, ability and Americanism by every member of this illustrious House. He had a limitless capacity for making friends and inspiring the faith and confidence of his people. His sincerity of purpose, friendliness of nature and gentility of soul—his profound faith, fairness and amiable human traits compelled deep respect and enduring affection.

By his untimely passing into that land from whose bourne no traveler returns, Doc SMITH has left an irreplaceable void in this Chamber where he served so faithfully and with such outstanding distinction for many years. His achievements were many and great—his devotion to duty unsurpassed—his love of his country and his fellow man never to be exceeded. His noble fellowship will long inspire us to greater devotion and effort.

The great New England poet, Longfellow, put it well:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime
And departing leave behind us
Footsteps on the sands of time.
Footsteps that perhaps another
Traveling o'er life's weary main
Some forlorn and shipwrecked brother
Seeing shall take heart again.

In the life, philosophy and unselfish service of LAWRENCE SMITH we can all "take heart" in the tasks which face us. His memory will be hallowed here. And his high idealism and patriotism, his love of God and country and his fellow man will long remain to inspire us.

To his bereaved, loving wife and devoted family, I join in extending most heartfelt sympathy. May they find in their unflinching faith the blessings and consolations that the Heavenly Father alone can bestow, and may they be strengthened to bear the irreparable loss which they have sustained by the thoughts of a loving soul who gave unselfishly and courageously of himself to the very end.

May the soul of our dear, beloved friend, LAWRENCE SMITH, rest in eternal peace.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of our friend and colleague, LARRY SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to join those who have spoken in tribute to his memory.

An attorney, a veteran of World War I, and a Member of this House for 17 years, he was a devoted public servant and true friend.

He gave of himself without stint in the service of his district and the Nation.

He won widespread respect and affection among his colleagues.

The eloquent words which have been spoken here this morning since his sudden death in the Capitol bear witness to his high character, his fine ability, his devotion to duty, and his capacity for friendship.

I have valued his friendship ever since he came to the Congress. I shall miss him greatly.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife, to his family, and all those close to him.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there was no more conscientious or faithful servant in the House of Representatives than LARRY SMITH. He was constantly at work for the interests of his constituents and he was extraordinarily honest in the fulfillment of his convictions. Time and again he stood up in the Hall of Congress defending what he believed to be right and for the best interests of our country, and it made no difference to him whether the cause he was pleading was a popular one or not. What mattered to Congressman SMITH was whether he thought it was right and honest. With such a character, there can be no wonder at the admiration and the friendliness of all who came in contact with him.

He was indeed a gentle man, never harsh in his judgments, always respecting the feelings of others and forever willing to lend a helping hand. In the later years when his health was not too good, he never let up in his work but assumed the responsibilities of his office with a courage that brought inspiration and hope to his many friends. The House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member, and those who were counted among his friends have been glorified by his friendship and their faith has been strengthened by the example of his life.

I extend my most sincere and heartfelt sympathies to his widow and family and may they be comforted in the knowledge of the affection in which he was held.

He never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed though right were worsted
Wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise
Our battles to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their eulogy of Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH. "LARRY," as he was affectionately known to us, was one of those rare individuals who was always willing to express his views, even though they differed from those of others. He was a martyr to that which he believed and he had many, many Members of Congress who would join with him in his beliefs.

The records show that he was highly respected by the membership, and he, with his lovely and gracious wife, Eleanor, will go down in the records of the Congress as individuals who represented a hard-working team in their district.

Words fail me when I attempt to express by sincere sympathy to Eleanor and

the family. Our prayers and best wishes will be with them always.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am filled with sorrow at the suddenness of the death of my very close friend, LARRY SMITH.

Many things can be said of him. However, I merely express the thought that he was a great American, a great legislator, and a man of convictions in the preservation of his country.

Mrs. Becker joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his good wife, Eleanor, and his family. Our prayers will be with them at this time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I entertained the highest respect and admiration for LAWRENCE SMITH. I counted him as a friend. He was an understanding, sympathetic, big-hearted type of person. And, as every last one of his colleagues in this House knows, he was a man of the highest honor who always put the country's welfare ahead of partisan or selfish considerations. Who among us can say as much?

This fallen statesman was in the fullest measure just what he pretended to be. As Socrates put it:

The shortest and surest way to live with honor in the world is to be in reality what we would appear to be; all human virtues increase and strengthen themselves by the practice and experience of them.

I share with my colleagues a deep feeling of loss in the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH. The entire Nation is the loser. And I extend to the surviving family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from Wisconsin and other Members of the House in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory, life, and service of our esteemed colleague and friend, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin.

As others have indicated he was one of the most respected Members of the House and his absence in this body will be sorely felt. Wisconsin and the Nation have lost a deeply consecrated public official.

In a very personal way I should like to say that LAWRENCE SMITH assisted me very materially in the passage of a piece of legislation in my early years of service in the Congress and his friendship in this matter to me, a freshman Member, created a tie which I have greatly valued ever since.

He served with devotion and distinction as a member of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs where he carved a record which will long endure. The most enduring monuments are those erected by devoted service to the Republic.

I wish to extend an expression of my sympathy to the members of the family.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to the many, many personal friends to learn of the sudden passing this noon of my very close friend, LARRY SMITH, the ranking Member of the Wisconsin delegation.

From his early youth, he was devoted to the cause of the general welfare and better livelihood of his fellow man. His service to his country began in the United States Army during the First World War and he did not forget his comrades-in-arms but continued his interest in vari-

ous positions of leadership in the American Legion.

LARRY SMITH believed in the principles of our Founding Fathers. He was a staunch supporter of the American way of life. He was unshakeable in his convictions and even those who may have opposed his strong viewpoints respected his honesty and integrity in arriving at a conclusion. This world and this Congress needs more men of the type of LARRY SMITH.

His family has lost a loving and considerate husband and father. His friends will find it hard to fill the void that his counsel and fortitude have left and his constituents, whom he represented so faithfully and so loyally in the Halls of Congress, have lost a champion of their rights.

I want to extend to his beloved wife, Eleanor, and his children Mrs. Scudder's and my deepest and heartfelt sympathy. We share in their loss and we fully realize that mere words cannot make up for it. May it be a comfort to them to know that our prayers are with them.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH was one of the outstanding Americans of our time. He was a courageous, loyal, forthright, and enthusiastic American. He could stand alone. Propaganda and conformity had no effect on LAWRENCE SMITH. He dedicated his life to the principles of Americanism that made this country the greatest nation in the history of the world. He believed in every letter of the Constitution and in preserving it as written.

Congressman SMITH did not believe that friendship could be bought, nor national wealth acquired by spending and waste. He was a bitter foe of totalitarianism and centralization of our own Government. He believed in individual liberty and had confidence in the people's ability to govern themselves at the local and State level. His forthright foreign policy is day by day being proven the policy that this Nation should have followed. We go from one crisis into a more deepening crisis with this same old foreign policy of spending.

I entertain the hope that this Congress will yet adopt Representative SMITH's foreign policy which, I believe, is the only sure way to preserve this Republic and its basic, fundamental liberties.

He was sincere, kindly, and every inch a gentleman. He was my warm personal friend and I am going to miss him every day that I serve in this Congress. In all of his courageous fight, he has had the help of one of the finest ladies that it has ever been my privilege to know—Mrs. Lawrence Smith. Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to her and her fine family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am grieved by the death of our beloved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin. He came to the House a very short time after I first was elected a Member of Congress and I have known him intimately through the years. His service to the Nation was outstanding. He distinguished himself by his capable, studious, and able approach to the many momentous problems which confronted us during his service here. At no time did LARRY SMITH fail to stand on his own two

feet and by so doing he gained the admiration and respect of each of us.

It is a sad thing to note the passing of a good friend. As I look back over our service together I am further saddened by the realization that his important voice in legislation is now stilled forever.

I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the times in which we live has placed on the Members of this Congress grave responsibilities for decisions which will shape the course of history. Let no one doubt the sincerity with which the tasks confronting us are met.

This concern has taken from this Chamber another colleague in a session already marked by the loss of several others.

I was lunching with a group from my State of North Dakota when LARRY SMITH of Wisconsin approached. I called to him, to introduce him to those with whom I was lunching. Even before his friendly smile could form in greeting, he pitched forward across the table, stricken with the attack which claimed his life.

Mr. Speaker, I need not express the shock I felt in that moment. The loss of Congressman SMITH has been well expressed by his colleagues from Wisconsin, and by other Members of this House. It is a personal loss which I feel very deeply. Mr. Speaker, for I had learned to love and respect LAWRENCE SMITH. Each Member must feel that loss, as will the country he served so well. To Mrs. Smith, and to their children, my deepest sympathies are extended.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked over the passing of one of our most outstanding colleagues in the person of LAWRENCE SMITH, chairman of the Wisconsin Congressional delegation.

It was my good fortune to have known LARRY intimately since I first became a Member of the House of Representatives. He served his country in World War I and upon his return from the service he became affiliated with the American Legion and later served as State commander of the Department of Wisconsin.

He was a man dedicated to his work as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was a true American and always fought for those things he believed in.

The House has lost a fine colleague and I have lost a good friend. To Mrs. Smith and to his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened when I learned of the death in the United States Capitol Building of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH.

During the 11 years I have served as a Member of the House of Representatives I have had the privilege of becoming acquainted with many outstanding people from every section of our country. Of those with whom I have served here, LARRY SMITH was one whom I regarded as really an outstanding Member. He was able. He had the capacity to get to the bottom of an issue and determine the facts. He could distinguish the true from the false. He could determine whether a proposition was meritorious or frivolous.

He was courageous. He did not trim his sails to meet every passing breeze. Once he had determined what was right and just, he had the courage to support his beliefs and convictions with all the energy and force at his command. He was kind and gentle by nature, a warm-hearted and loyal friend.

He loved America and its institutions. He believed in constitutional government, and abhorred sham and make-believe.

I regarded LARRY SMITH as one of the truly great Americans of our time. He will be greatly missed not only in his circle of friends and acquaintances, and not only by his family and his constituents in the home district. He will be missed by all those who believe in constitutional government and Americanism. Our country is greater and stronger because of his efforts. It will be difficult indeed to replace him.

I extend deepest sympathy to his wife and family in this time of bereavement.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected passing of our colleague, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, was a particular shock to me, because it had been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 83d Congress.

I had the pleasant and rewarding experience of working closely with him on a subcommittee which enjoyed his distinguished and fairminded chairmanship. In this study of the scope and effectiveness of the mutual assistance programs of the United States, LARRY SMITH brought to his work a keen and methodical mind and an unassailable intellectual integrity.

It was characteristic of our late colleague to be considerate and gentle with others and respectful of viewpoints which might conflict with his own. He was stern, however, in judging himself and, in doing so, epitomized the true public servant. In his constant effort to find the truth, and to act in legislative matters on the basis of a studious appraisal of their relationship to the public good, he never spared himself. LARRY SMITH did not shape his convictions on public issues impulsively or to fit a pattern of political action drawn up for him by someone else.

In the high standards of conduct in public life which he set for himself, our friend from Wisconsin provided a worthy example for us all. Ever mindful of the dignity of this House and his responsibilities to the citizens who sent him here to guard their interests, he served with distinction his country, his State, and the district he so honorably represented.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his widow and children in this bereavement, a loss profoundly felt by all who knew and respected him.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened and shocked to learn of the sudden passing of LAWRENCE H. SMITH who served so well and conscientiously for a number of years for the great State of Wisconsin. I had the privilege and pleasure of talking to Congressman SMITH almost daily since his office was located near my office in the Old House Office Building. Congressman SMITH always seemed to be in good spirits, and I thought he had completely

recovered from the heart attack he suffered some time ago.

I am certain that there is not a Member of the United States Congress who worked longer hours than Congressman SMITH. He was one of the finest men that I have had the pleasure and privilege of knowing since I have been a Member of this great body. He was an American first and never made any compromise with a principle. He voted his convictions at all times and could give you a good reason as to why and how he cast his vote without being disagreeable. I do not believe that he had an enemy on the floor of the House, and I cannot imagine his having one in his great State which he so ably represented.

I certainly feel much richer for having the privilege of knowing Mr. SMITH, and he has left a great example for all of us to follow. I know that he was a great believer in the Constitution of the United States, and he believed in this great document as it was written and not as it has been interpreted by certain people. The State of Wisconsin and the Nation as a whole have lost one of their most valuable citizens in the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his lovely wife and family. We shall all greatly miss Mr. SMITH not only as a Congressman but as a friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today the flag above the United States Capitol flies at half staff. A most distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH, has died.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a statesman who had dedicated himself to his country. He was a gentleman of strong convictions and great integrity and, having possessed these qualities, he became an outstanding leader of the House.

He was a kindly man, devoted to his fellow man. He was a loving husband and father who was adored by his family.

This country, in whose service LAWRENCE SMITH actually died, will sorely miss the contribution he could have continued to make in his country's behalf had God seen fit to spare him longer.

One of the first people I met when I came to Congress was "LAURIE" SMITH. He advised me with respect to many, many matters.

He and his charming wife, Eleanor, several times visited at our home in Troy.

I deeply regret the passing of this friend whom I admired so much and I deeply grieve for his wife and family whose loss is irreparable.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this body has been in a state of shock ever since we learned of the sudden passing of our great and good friend LARRY SMITH. The high regard in which he was held by the entire membership without regard to party affiliation is a tribute not only to his integrity but also to the unvarying sweetness of his temperament and his unflinching cheerfulness even in the face of the most depressing reverses.

In the eulogies given in his memory on this floor I have detected a degree of sadness and a sense of personal loss which has not been noticed on previous occasions when we have paused to mark the passing of a departed brother. And on the faces of those who did not speak there

was the mark of deep sadness that always comes when we see a great public servant like this good friend move on to that great convocation of those who have loved and served the Lord.

LARRY SMITH's life was one of dedication, starting with honorable service in World War I, a term as State commander of the American Legion, and then a year of high pride and satisfaction as he stood on the sidelines while his gracious wife filled the high office of national president of the American Legion Auxiliary. Yes; LARRY SMITH's life was marked by many milestones of service; but we, his friends and colleagues, will remember him for his courtesy, and I shall remember that only a day ago he dropped his hand on my shoulder as he passed me and said: "It's a good day, Paul." May the Great Comforter console the loved ones who are left to mourn, and may He grant his soul eternal peace.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that we record the passing of one of our patriotic, conscientious, and hard-working Congressman, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of the First District of Wisconsin.

Congressman SMITH came into the 77th Congress a few months after I became a Member. We were personal friends. We pay tribute to a great Congressman. This was a great loss not only to the First District of Wisconsin, but also to this House and our Nation.

LARRY, as his friends all called him, was a serious, studious, devoted and dedicated Congressman. His work came first and was taken seriously. He gave his very best, never sparing himself and undoubtedly his intense concentration on his work certainly hastened his early departure.

I join with the many Congressmen here today in expressing our sympathy to his wife and family and assure them that we shall miss him greatly.

Congressman SMITH was a real student of foreign affairs and on this committee he devoted his energy and carried out with great effort the ideas and the program which he felt was proper for this Nation to support. He had the admiration, the respect and love of the Members of this House regardless of political affiliation. While many disagreed with him, all of them admired Congressman SMITH and commended him for his zeal and his purpose.

We shall miss him but he shall not be forgotten.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult to realize that LAWRENCE SMITH is not among us but has moved on to a greater reward. His distinguished service to community, State, and Nation—yes; even beyond—to all free peoples of the world is written in the pages of the proceedings of the Congress and the history of his home State of Wisconsin.

His warm friendship made easier the work of his colleagues and associates, and firmly places his memory in the recesses of our heart.

His lovely wife, Eleanor, was always at his side. Her leadership in women's organizations and her interest always complemented LAWRENCE's work.

Mrs. McIntire joins me in extending to Eleanor and the family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected passing of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH was a great shock to all of us.

We were all happy to hear of his recent recovery from a serious illness and hoped that he would be with us in full vigor and health, but destiny had other plans and now he has gone.

I knew and admired LARRY SMITH ever since I came to Congress. He was a man of great and firm convictions and with the courage to express and stand by them.

I enjoyed his sincere friendliness. He was always helpful and willing to give of his time and talents on any subject he was interested in.

LARRY SMITH was a great American and spent most of his time and energy in defending and protecting this Nation against its enemies.

His services in the House of Representatives will be difficult to replace.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathy and condolences to his wife and family.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin, deeply shocked and saddened me.

LARRY SMITH was a scholarly hard-working gentleman who won the esteem, respect, and affection of all who came to know him. He served with distinction on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and while I often disagreed with him on foreign affairs I learned to respect his views.

The House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member who served his district, State, and country with great devotion to duty. I have lost a good friend. To his devoted wife and children, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as so well pointed out by those who have spoken, LARRY SMITH's passing brought grief and a sense of great loss to us. His profoundly religious spirit was expressed in many ways, in his devotion to what he believed to be right, in the gentle way in which he expressed his own point of view without offense to those who differed with him, in the disciplined way of life which characterized his career, and in his uncomplaining manner of accepting a long illness. He seemed to be living by the sentiment expressed by Whittier:

I know not what the future hath
Of marvel or surprise,
Assured alone that life and death
His mercy underlies.

I shall miss him in the meetings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the unofficial conferences on problems of underprivileged people which we were accustomed to attend, and in the Sunday morning services of Calvary Baptist Church which was his Washington church home.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH we have lost the statesman who better than anyone else could express the views of the great heartland of America. The United

States would be in a far stronger position, a real leader in world affairs, if the policies advocated by LAWRENCE SMITH had been followed. We would be far stronger economically, as well.

During the past several years I have had the great benefit of his advice and support in efforts to modify the status-of-forces treaties. Having his support, I knew my position was correct. In this, as in everything else, LAWRENCE SMITH would have the United States of America act its rightful role as a sovereign nation, and a powerful nation, confident, forthright, and fair in its dealings with others.

America has suffered a staggering loss, far transcending the deep personal grief that all of us must feel.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution—House Resolution 450.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. WITHROW, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. VAN PELT, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. REUSS, Mr. TEWES, Mr. GORDON, and Mrs. CHURCH.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 23, 1958, pursuant to its previous order, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1495. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, and for other purposes, in the amount of \$2,896,519,968, for various agencies (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1496. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report showing the condition of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1956 and 1957, pursuant to Public Law

724, 79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1497. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1498. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 10 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1363); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1499. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 49 reports covering 61 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1500. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on House Administration.

1501. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 9, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a letter report on the Severn River, with particular reference to Ringgold Cove, Anne Arundel County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1502. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs: H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to 13, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs: H. J. Res. 509. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York, N. Y., from May 7 to 17, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:
H. R. 10192. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the

National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10193. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10196. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10195. A bill to amend section 103 of the Dependents' Medical Care Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10194. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10197. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to clearly authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to waive the requirements of section 10 thereof under such conditions and to such extent as he may prescribe in connection with inspection under the act prior to January 1, 1959; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 10198. A bill to create a rebuttable presumption that stolen diamonds of a value of \$50,000 or more have been transported in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10199. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for finality of orders of the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10200. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10201. A bill to provide that the chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission shall rotate among the Commissioners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 10202. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 10203. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 10204. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended,

relating to price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCINTOSH:

H. R. 10205. A bill to provide that the rate of duty applicable to wheat fit for human consumption shall apply to seed wheat unfit for human consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 10206. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10207. A bill authorizing the modification of the Crisfield Harbor, Md., project in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 10208. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, to provide for the coordination and integration of policies and procedures with respect to Federal programs in the fields of science and technology; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 10209. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the free State of Israel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 10210. A bill to amend title I of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall approve the acquisition of certain lands of national historical significance, or interests therein, for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEWES:

H. R. 10211. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10212. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 510. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10213. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Bernabe Dela Cena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10214. A bill for the relief of Basile G. Skalenakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amina Youssif Cosino (nee Simaan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 10216. A bill for the relief of John Haskell Chesshir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10217. A bill for the relief of Chan Yick Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10218. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Diamantidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 10219. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Bourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10220. A bill for the relief of William E. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10221. A bill for the relief of the Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 10222. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonio Ferrise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

362. Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition adopted by 25 residents of Barnegat, Ocean County, N. J., requesting that the advertising of alcoholic beverages be removed from radio and television advertising in connection with sports events, keeping in mind the fact that thousands of children are devoted to sports, especially in baseball; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

363. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, Joint Committee on the National Capital, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted at its meeting on January 18, 1958, in support of House bills 9239, 9510, and 9595, and Senate bill 2283, and requesting that public hearings be held on these bills; to the Committee on Public Works.

364. Also, petition of the secretary general, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted at a convention at Miami Beach, Fla., on October 23, 1957, strongly urging that restrictions against trading with Communist China and Russia be continued and tightened; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, which the Russian Com-

munists destroyed in 1920. I have been privileged to address branch meetings of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on many occasions. I am glad to have this opportunity to extend my congratulations to this organization which is doing such a splendid job in keeping the cause of Ukrainian independence alive today.

There is little doubt but that Moscow's enduring fear of its captive nations and peoples still remains one of the firmest deterrents to war. Today in Ukraine, for example, which is the largest captive

non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, Moscow is waging a vicious anti-American campaign to convince the Ukrainian people that the American imperialists are like the Nazi liberators in World War II. However, the current difficulties of the Soviet Union still continue and will continue as long as the Ukrainian people and indeed all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, believe that they have not been forgotten by the Free World. The recent letter of President Eisenhower to Soviet Prime Minister Bulganin, which held that the fate of the captive peoples

of Eastern Europe remained a proper subject for discussion at a possible summit meeting is ample proof that this Government has indeed not forgotten those peoples.

I want again to commend the Congress Committee for its efforts on behalf of Ukraine's aspirations for national freedom and to assure them of my continued efforts to render them all possible assistance in this fight for the freedom of their own people.

Ukrainian Independence and Cultural Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, commemoration of Ukrainian independence reminds us that the Ukrainian people have suffered and continue to suffer great injustices at the hands of their rulers in Moscow. The Free World is familiar with the Soviet massacre at Vinnytsya, the enforced famine in the early 1930's, and the general suppression of Ukrainian patriotism. The Free World is less familiar, however, with the more subtle Soviet acts of discrimination in the area of linguistics and literature. Discrimination and suppression of this nature do not have the dramatic effect of other Soviet actions, but they are important because they strike at a vital area of Ukrainian national life.

For over two decades the Soviets have tried to impose upon Ukrainians the supremacy of the Russian language and to relegate the Ukrainian language to the level of an obsolescent native dialect. Russian words have been introduced into the language, and their usage established by decree as the accepted norm for the writing of literature, both official material and that of a strictly literary character. Publication of a Ukrainian-Russian dictionary which clearly gave the Russian language a distinct advantage was a powerful Soviet device in the Russification of Ukrainian culture.

The extent to which the Soviets continue to discriminate against the Ukrainians and other nationalities in the U. S. S. R. was brought to light by a recent analysis of a book list of Soviet publications of important newspapers and periodicals for 1956. According to this analysis, 62.3 percent of the total number of 559 titles were published in the Russian S. F. S. R.; the remainder was published in the other 15 Republics. Moreover, only 156 of the 212 publications, or 27.9 percent, published by the non-Russian Republics were actually printed in the national language. Of the remaining 56 publications, 50 were printed in Russian and 6 both in Russian and some other language. Furthermore, only newspapers and periodicals of general interest were published in the language of the nationalities, whereas the few professional and other specialized

literature were published in Russian. The inequity of Soviet nationality policy is brought into clearer focus by the fact that the Russians comprise only slightly more than 50 percent of the entire population of the U. S. S. R.

In the face of such calculated discrimination doubtless the Ukrainian language and the Ukrainian cultural tradition will be placed in jeopardy; for "Russification" is a corrosive force that has thus left its mark upon the Ukraine. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian people have a great pride in their nation, its literature, and its language. And, however intensive the Soviet drive of "Russification," they will resist, and they will preserve their national soul.

On this 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence it is fitting that we pay tribute to the Ukrainian people and extend to them a word of comfort in their struggle for cultural survival and freedom.

H. R. 8002

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent given me I submit the following letter for the RECORD:

THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT,

Research Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have a very queer letter from you in connection with H. R. 8002.

Every letter put out by your organization indicates that you do not have the slightest conception of what the proposed bill would be. It sets up a scheme to operate the Government very largely by contract authority, a scheme which has been found by practice to be absolutely dangerous, and one which will utterly destroy the control of Congress over Government expenditures. If you really meant to be honest about it, you would pay attention to the situation and grasp that the thing you are doing is extremely dangerous and will be disastrous to our country.

The first year such a thing was in operation, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if he was a big enough faker, could claim that he had saved a lot of money, and he could say that after the second year, but the third year the chickens would come home to roost, and the appropriations required to meet the accrued indebtedness would be way beyond what they had ever been, and after that time there would be no way of counting anything. Every single bit of literature that you people have put out indicates a total lack of appreciation of the problem that Congress is confronted with, and the lack of interest in doing a good job.

I hate to be spending time and money on this when, if you would only do something constructive, there is such a great opportunity to activate a real savings. To start with, we should get rid of the performance budget which is costing us billions of dollars every year. The only support for the bill is, presently, the pressure from people who do not understand it, and there is such a terrible unwillingness on the part of those who are backing it to sit down and appreciate the dangerous course which you are pursuing.

I suppose it is too late now to expect you to turn over a new leaf, but I would feel

that, in view of the recent document which you addressed to me, I owed you one last effort to try and get you to take an intelligent position on this matter.

Very sincerely yours.

Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 95th anniversary of one of the great events in the history of the Polish nation and of the freedom-loving peoples of the world. It is of particular significance today to recall this particular instance of the enduring heroism of these brave people. On this day, 95 years ago, Polish patriots led an insurrection against Russian control. Unfortunately, the insurrection failed and Poland was annexed to the Russian Empire. Multitudes of brave, patriotic Poles were subjected to barbarous punishment and entire villages were exiled. The flame of freedom and independence, however, continued to burn. It continues to this day.

While some measure of permanent autonomy for Poland has been wrested from the Soviet Government, we commemorate this event in the hope that its independence will continue to grow.

Americans in recalling the irrepressible spirit of the Polish nation must ask themselves if the United States is doing all it can to assist the forces of freedom throughout the world.

Mindful of our traditions and of the contributions of Polish-Americans to the free life of America over the past three and one-half centuries, our unfair immigration policies must be changed so as to allow entry into the United States of Polish exiles and refugees.

Finally, we must develop a firm United States diplomatic policy to help all the oppressed peoples of the world.

The American and the Polish peoples have been in the forefront of the fight for liberty. We pray that the valiant Polish nation will soon have its deserved share of that most precious of all possessions, human freedom.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I join with my colleagues and all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world in sending greetings to those who

continue to fight for the liberation of the Ukrainian people and all peoples in the enslaved nations. We, in the United States, who are dedicated to human liberty, are ever cognizant of the continuing struggle of the Ukrainian people for national independence.

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest assets in the struggle to maintain and extend the blessings of liberty to all peoples throughout the world lies in the spirit of freedom and independence which still burns in the hearts of men and women behind the Iron Curtain. No greater fear exists in the minds of the masters of the Kremlin than that this spirit will overflow and sweep away the reign of terror imposed on these peoples. To their undying resolve to combat Communist tyranny we owe our everlasting gratitude.

On this day, 40 years ago, the people of the Ukraine formed a free and independent national republic. They had played an important role in the destruction of the czarist dictatorship. Now they expressed their desire to live in liberty by forming a popular government representative of their wishes and aspirations. Bold and courageous as this step was, it was destined to be obliterated under the ruthless heel of Communist tyranny. In 1920 the hordes of the Red army swept into the Ukraine, crushing the new Republic and placing in its stead a puppet regime, nominally free, but actually subservient to Moscow in thought and deed.

However brutally this was accomplished, however mercilessly the opposition was eliminated, the flame of freedom could not be quenched. Since the ninth century the people of the Ukraine had enjoyed a tradition of independence. The new, self-styled, arbiters of the fate of the Ukraine were to find it no easy task to destroy that heritage.

In the years that followed, many fled to the Free World. I have known many of these gallant people who have made their homes in my home city of Rochester. They have proved excellent citizens and have contributed much to the cultural vigor of the community. Their devotion to a free way of life has enriched our whole country.

Others stayed behind to continue the fight for freedom in another way. Year after year the Ukraine has been a hotbed of agitation. Year after year it has proved a powerful reminder that men may live in slavery, but they dream of freedom, that shackles may bind the flesh but cannot bind the mind. In the past 12 months courageous men and women have risked their lives to send the

message ringing around the world: "We shall be free. We shall not remain slaves to the thirst for power of a few men who rule for themselves alone. When fear seeks to destroy freedom, it is fear itself that will be destroyed."

In a day of missiles and nuclear weapons, it is well to take time on this 40th anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian Republic to remember this: The power of the human spirit and its eternal craving for freedom is a greater force against tyranny than our most destructive hydrogen bomb. To those in bondage behind the Iron Curtain we must give our continued assurance that their resistance is not in vain, that theirs is not a forgotten front.

Our country is the stronger today for their efforts, just as it is richer for the contributions their brothers have made here. May the time not be far off when all may join in the celebration of a new and lasting independence.

The Polish Insurrection of 1863: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, commemoration of the Polish Insurrection of 1863 calls the attention of the Free World to the fact that Poland has been in the past as in the present a victim of Russian imperialism.

Poland has also been a victim of a less tangible adversary, geographic determinism. A nation cannot escape its geography, and in the case of Poland geography has proved to be one of its mortal enemies.

For decades, even centuries, Poland has been between the anvil and the hammer of Russian power on the one side and Germanic power on the other. Polish history is marked by many partitions solely because it had become a pawn in the great power struggle between the Slav and the Teuton.

Presently, geographic factors loom large in the determination of Polish foreign policy. However much the Polish Communist regime may wish to follow the example of Tito, if indeed that is its ambition, it cannot escape the cold, hard fact that Poland's eastern border adjoins the Soviet Union and that its western border adjoins Communist East Germany, in which many Soviet divisions are stationed, ready to close like a pincer from east and west in the event of a Polish uprising. Facts such as these are important to understand, for they encourage a more realistic appraisal of the highly difficult position the Polish people are in today.

Thus, the Poles are truly a captive people. But they had been a captive people before, and history records that they had emerged from their captivity to establish a genuine independent republic.

What the future holds for these gallant people we do not know. But the promise of the future may well be freedom and genuine national independence. A people so gifted, so heroic, and so resolute are deserving of nothing less.

Ninety-fifth Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863, January 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years ago—while our forefathers were locked in the Civil War—the people of Poland took up arms against their Russian oppressors.

The Polish Insurrection was short lived, but the heroic effort of those courageous Poles became part of the noble Polish heritage that flared forth again at Poznan in 1956. And it became part of the heritage that formed the hard core of resistance to Communist tyranny which has won the Polish nation a limited amount of relief from the crushing excesses of Communist oppression.

Indeed, the Polish people have resisted several attempts to destroy their national identity. The Russians failed to make Russians of them in 1863. The Austrian and German Empires failed at similar tasks. I have no doubt that the Polish people will also successfully resist today's efforts to communize them.

For the Poles have learned the value and the high cost of freedom, and they are strong in their knowledge. On January 22, the 95th anniversary of the Polish Insurrection, we in this country salute their courage and their dedication to freedom at any cost.

The 40th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today on the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, which the Russian Communists destroyed in 1920, I extend felicitations to the people of Ukraine and best wishes to these brave people in connection with their aspirations for national freedom. As a captive nation they have long endured suffering and hardship and despite the domination of Soviet tyrants have never relinquished their will and courage to advance the cause of democracy.

It is my fervent hope that these enslaved people will soon enjoy the independence and freedom which they have so long cherished.

Commemorating the 40th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, today it is most fitting that all Americans join in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence; that we extend a hand of friendship across the Iron Curtain barrier as an expression of the devotion our peoples share for human and national freedom.

Tragically, there can be no similar observance in the Ukraine. The bright flame of freedom which lighted that nation with such promise 40 years ago has been darkened by the bitter night of communistic tyranny.

The Ukrainian people, whose love of and striving for freedom dates back more than 1,000 years, saw their new-born republic's independence die in 1920, when Red Russian armies took over their country and its government. Since that time, the brutal tide of Communist conquest has engulfed many free nations; today, that tide threatens the peace of all the world.

During these days of crisis, however, one basic truth stands out. Despite the brutal oppression of Godless communism, it has not been able to obliterate the freedom-loving spirit of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Nowhere is this truth more evident than among the 40 million people of the Ukraine. Through the long years of subjugation—in which their religious beliefs have been trampled upon, their patriots liquidated, their citizens thrown into slave labor camps—the Ukrainian people have steadfastly and courageously rebelled against their Communist oppressors.

Even today, reports from behind the Iron Curtain indicate that this underground fight continues. Indeed, there are indications that—despite its advances in new weapons of war—the Kremlin's weak spot still is its constant fear of its captive nations.

That is why, today as we rededicate our enduring friendship with the brave people of the Ukraine, I would like to make a part of the RECORD an excellent analytical article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last December. I believe this article warrants the closest study by all of us in the Congress. It follows:

UNITED STATES DEFENSE AND AVIATION—DEATH SENTENCES REVEAL RED UPSETS IN UKRAINE
(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The Soviet Union unquestionably is having current difficulties in the Ukraine, its traditional granary, as well as a prime source of coal for its heavy industry and a major

training ground for Soviet scientists and technicians.

Official Soviet reports of death sentences just passed upon a group of Ukrainian nationalists and partisans from the Rovno Province bordering on the Pripet Marshes appear to confirm stories related by refugees from Hungary. These were to the effect that before the Budapest revolt of last year, Soviet soldiers had told them of recent fighting between regular Red army troops and Ukrainian partisans—although such anti-Soviet guerrilla warfare was believed to have ended in 1949.

SECOND LARGEST REPUBLIC

One-fourth of the Soviet Union's annual class of young scientists and technicians graduate from institutions in the once independent Ukraine, now the second largest republic of the U. S. S. R. The great astronomical observatory at Kiev—the ancient Ukrainian capital—and the Gravimetric Institute of Poltava, where Peter the Great crushed the combined Swedish and Ukrainian Armies in 1709, are currently chief centers of Soviet scientific participation in the International Geophysical Year.

One present task of the Kiev observatory is directing monitoring connected with the Soviet sputniks. This background drops clues as to why such wide publicity is being given to the alleged experiences in the United States of Prof. Orest Stephen Makar—now working as a professor of geodesy at the Polytechnic Institute of Lvov in the western Ukraine.

Professor Makar came as a supposed refugee to the United States in 1949. He now is believed to have been a Soviet agent during his entire stay in this country. But amazingly, after being dismissed from St. Louis University he secured employment at the White Sands, N. Mex., atomic and guided missile proving grounds with limited clearance to handle within his scientific specialty classified material up to secret. After being naturalized in October 1956, he went to Stockholm and then suddenly fled with his wife into the Soviet Union.

Geodesy is a branch of applied mathematics particularly important in long-range guided-missile work. It comprises methods used to determine by observation and measurement the exact position of cities and other geographical points around the globe. Professor Makar was interviewed and re-interviewed after his arrival in Moscow, where he was hailed as one of the world's foremost experts on aerial photography.

But in a new broadside recently published in Pravda and republished throughout the Ukraine—Professor Makar charges that all the Slavs including the Ukrainians are being discriminated against in the United States. They are regarded in America as second-class people, according to him and cannot rise above the level of manual laborer. The actual facts are that there now are more than 1,500,000 Ukrainians and persons of immediate Ukrainian descent in the United States, who have gained an unusual reputation for being good, hard-working citizens. Many like Prof. Lev Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and the late film star, John Hodiak, won high places in law and education as well as in the arts and sciences.

LAUDED BY EISENHOWER

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, whose activities to promote good citizenship and advance the cause of democracy on a worldwide scale recently have been commended by President Eisenhower and such political liberals as Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, says in a reply: "It is clear that the Makar charge must be part of a widespread new anti-American propaganda campaign of the Kremlin policy-makers."

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to these valiant people in their fight for freedom from Russian domination.

When the Russian Empire was shattered after the Russian Revolution of 1917, nearly all non-Russian elements of that loosely held and ill-governed autocracy began to clamor for freedom and national independence. Forty million Ukrainians, the most powerful and the largest of these elements, were very anxious to act likewise. Even before the end of the First World War they had the chance, and early in 1918, on January 22, they proclaimed their national independence and established a Republic. That proclamation, issued exactly 40 years ago, is a distinct landmark in the political history of the Ukrainians. It represents the culmination of their centuries-old arduous and costly struggle for the attainment of their national goal—the realization of their long-cherished political independence.

For 2½ years, the Ukrainians—under their patriotic and self-sacrificing leaders—fought against invaders from the north and from the east, and managed to safeguard their hard-won independence.

Unfortunately, in the end they were forced to surrender their independence, their country—and their all to Communist Russians in November of 1920. Since then the Ukrainians have sacrificed themselves by the millions and have suffered much under the unrelenting tyranny of Communist totalitarianism, yet even under this inhuman regime, brave and stout-hearted Ukrainians have kept up their spirit of independence.

As the Ukrainians celebrate this memorable day, let us all hope and pray that their persistent struggle will be rewarded and they will once more be free and independent people.

The 40th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in an age when we are conscious of intercontinental missiles and traversing the mysteries of outer space; when the spread of communism is prevalent throughout the

world, it is good to take time to consider the free-minded people in countries behind the Iron Curtain who still strive to attain the freedom they once knew.

Today Ukrainians everywhere commemorate the 40th anniversary of their independence which was torn from them by the Russian Communist in 1920.

The Ukraine is often referred to as "the bread basket of Russia." Its forty-million-odd people have a proud history extending back to the ninth century. Its mining industry ranks second in the world and the black soil region makes it a rich agricultural nation.

We can only continue our prayers and efforts for the liberation of this nation and all other countries suffering under the Communist heel and hope that in future years the celebrations will be ones of independence and not the anniversaries of the years when freedom reigned.

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today we welcome the opportunity to commend the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic as an independent nation. While the Ukraine is not today independent because of Soviet domination, we must never forget that the citizens of the Ukraine still yearn for a return to their freedom and to their rightful sovereignty, for the Ukrainian nation will always remember, and the Ukrainian people will never give up their fight or the right of self-determination.

It is for this reason each year that the Congress memorializes itself and the American people of the fact that the Ukraine is not a mere province of Russia but a proud nation. Recent death sentences in the Soviet Union indicate the turmoil which exists there and reveals the determination to upset Red domination of the Ukraine.

Ukrainian nationals continue to constitute the largest percentage of victims of Soviet slave labor in concentration camps. This all speaks well for the heroic struggle which Ukrainians are waging in their own way to resist Communist rule and to achieve freedom. Their expressed adherence to religious beliefs and theological principle in the face of determined Soviet efforts to subjugate the Ukrainian people is another indication of their refusal to be enslaved and exploited. During these days when our emphasis tends to be directed toward military preparedness and technological achievements, we often forget that we have allies behind the Iron Curtain who contribute in great measure to deterring Soviet aggression. We must not let these friends of democracy down. We must continue to respond to their aspirations

for freedom and for that future day when they can be permitted to travel throughout the world and to find reunion with their families everywhere.

Army Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to call to the attention of my colleagues a matter which I think is serious as far as the defense of our great country goes. I am afraid that we are being propagandized into doing too many of the things that the Russians would have us do.

We have become all too concerned about the satellite and about the missile program, and I am sure that it is very well we do, but not to the point where we will neglect one of the principal arms of defense of our great country—our Army.

I fear that we are now in the process of cutting the Army even below the danger point. The Secretary of the Army recommends 929,000 soldiers and it is felt by many of our Army personnel and the Secretary of the Army, that this is as low as we should go. During these times, when war could occur at any moment, when the security of this great country hangs in the balance, to my way of thinking, it is foolhardy and almost criminal for the Congress of the United States to sit idly by and let the Bureau of the Budget or any other branch of the Government cut the Army to the danger point. I dare say that there is not an Army officer in this country who would agree that the Army should be cut below a million men. It is the duty of the Bureau of the Budget and all other agencies created by Congress, to assist the Congress in doing its work. Are we to sit idly by and permit the destruction of our Army—start again to tear down the forts and camps that cost billions of dollars of taxpayers' money and again allow ourselves to be found shorthanded in the matter of trained men and material to defend our country? It may be argued by some, because of the missile program and the threat of attack by missiles, that we do not need the Army. In my humble opinion there will never come a time when the foot soldiers will not be called upon to bear the brunt of any war that may be fought now or hereafter. Should we be attacked, we would need a large and well equipped standing Army here at home for protection purposes alone, to say nothing of the need in the event we again were called upon to fight overseas. So, I appeal to you, my colleagues in the Congress, to study this program and study it well and hard, using your best judgment in not permitting the Bureau of the Budget or any other agency created by the Congress to dictate your thinking on this all important

matter. Let us go along with the Secretary of the Army and restore the \$250 million that will be needed and give him the right to recruit the necessary men to bring our Army to the required standard of not less than 929,000.

There is another thing I would like to discuss along this particular line at the present time and that regards the servicemen being discharged. I have had a number of officers come to my office, who have had as much as 17½ years service. All along they have been encouraged to make the Army their career and that has been their desire. They have had no thought of quitting the Army, but today they find themselves faced with the reality of being discharged against their wishes. Many of these officers could retire within the next year or two, and they have earned that retirement. I talked to one officer, just last week, and he told me that his being forced into leaving the Army against his wishes will cost him and his family in the neighborhood of \$90,000. To me it is unthinkable that the Government encourages men to go into the Army and make a career of it; yet the same Government finds it necessary to discharge those men against their wishes, thereby working hardships on the men and their families. So much for that.

My colleagues, I am afraid that we are being driven into doing things that Russia wants us to do by falling in line with propaganda from Russia. The destruction of our Army is one of them. By giving lip service to a great Army—by talking defense and means of defense—we are little by little destroying our Army, the very thing that we will need so badly if war should come. Let us not be caught short again. We have been caught short before in disaster, and may I say that in my humble opinion it has cost us many lives—many men and also many dollars. We will not have time if a war comes now with the present atomic missile weapons of war. May I repeat, we will not have time to prepare for war as we have in the past. We will have to be ready on the spot to begin immediately to defend our country and repair damage done by the enemy's bombs and if we do not have the manpower in our Army to do this, then again, our people and our great country will have to suffer for the shortsightedness of the Congress of the United States.

We are today, through our foreign-aid program, aiding others to bolster their economy and their power of defense. It certainly will be a sad thing if we spend our money building for other countries the things that they need to defend themselves and care for their people and then in the end find that we have bled ourselves white helping peoples in foreign nations and have neglected the most vital thing—being prepared to defend ourselves in an emergency. Nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand men for an Army—to care for as large a country as the United States. We certainly are not, in my opinion, using good judgment. Some of the people who are advising the Congress to cut down on the Army are merely men who know nothing about anything except figures. And all you hear is cut, cut, cut. I, too,

want to reduce taxes. I, too, want to operate as cheaply and economically as we possibly can, but there are many other places where waste and extravagance are being practiced which could and should be stopped. It will do no good to save \$250 million by cutting the Army to the danger point and then spending an equal amount or more on foreign aid.

I trust that my colleagues in the Congress of the United States will give serious consideration to voting to restore the \$250 million that the Secretary of the Army requests and which, I believe you will find, is sorely needed.

Saginaw Postal Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year, when the controversial subject of postal salaries is again expected to be before the Congress, I wish to bring to the attention of the House certain illuminating facts. They relate to the largest post office in my district, located at Saginaw, Mich.

First, with respect to examinations for the positions of clerks and letter carriers. From March 21, 1956, to November 27, 1957, 656 persons took the examinations. Of clerks who passed the examination, there were 28 on the active register and 64 on the inactive register for a total of 92 carriers passing the examination; there were 21 on the active register and 35 on the inactive register for a total of 56 or a grand total of 148 who passed the examination out of 656 applicants.

There were 47 eligibles who declined or who failed to reply to an offer of appointment. There were 2 clerks who were passed over 3 times and whose names were then removed from the register. During this 20-month period there were 50 appointments as clerks and carriers. Of these 50, 26—of whom 25 were clerks—vacated their positions after appointment. This clearly evidences, Mr. Speaker, the serious employment situation we have today in the Post Office Department if we are to presume that such an experience is typical throughout the country.

Now I would like to pay a brief tribute to the 82 regular clerks and 20 substitute clerks that staff the Saginaw Post Office. These figures cover the period October 19–December 27 of the past year which includes the pre-Christmas workload. During that time the post office at Saginaw has been allowed 40,589 work hours at about \$2 per hour; 5,562 hours of overtime at about \$3 per hour; and 9,974 hours of so-called Christmas assistance at about \$1.65 per hour. The hours actually used during that period came to 41,429 work hours, 5,345 overtime hours, and 8,007 Christmas assistance hours. With a little subtraction

and multiplication we find during this period that the Saginaw postal clerks saved the United States Government during these 10 weeks, the sum of \$2,246.55, even though postal receipts increased 5 percent over a year ago. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, to show that although the Saginaw postal clerks were disappointed over not getting their expected pay raise, they are not laying down on the job.

To recap briefly, I desire to call attention to two important matters: the employment situation within the Post Office Department is extremely serious, perhaps critical, but the postal employees themselves are giving, and I am sure will continue to give, their best efforts to the job at hand. The House should keep these two points in mind when postal pay legislation is again before us.

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, today is the 40th anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian Independence. It is gratifying to know that this day is a cause for recognition at New Haven, Conn., in the district which I represent. On this day, the Ukrainian flag flies its blue and gold colors of that nation over the city hall there.

Ukraine was one of the first nations to fall under the tyranny of the Bolshevik imperialists. Despite the destruction of her churches, horrible man-made famines of the 1930's, mass deportations, purges and murders, Ukraine's national spirit and her moral fiber have not dimmed the hope and passion of a nation whose destiny it is to be free and sovereign. She will go down in world history books as a symbol of the struggle for freedom and independence.

This strong and unebbing will for national liberty has been renewed through the centuries of Ukrainian human history from the 9th to the 14th century under the old Ukrainian Kievan State, in the Ukrainian Kozak in the 17th century, and most recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920.

Ukrainian Independence Day is a fitting means to demonstrate to the rest of the free world our protest to international communism, which treacherously designs the envelopment of the entire globe.

With over 40 million people, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, Ukraine stands as an important strategic ally in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism.

Ukraine has a historic right to national freedom. Her independence cannot be ignored. We of the Free World should stand staunchly behind this right

of the Ukrainians, if we are to be assured that the foundations of liberty and independence for all nations are to be preserved.

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, January 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we who are endowed with freedom remind ourselves that great numbers of our fellow men throughout the world do not enjoy the same liberty that we hold dear.

Therefore, on the 40th anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic's greatest attempt to free its people from oppression, it is especially appropriate that we pledge never to forget any of man's efforts to build a peaceful world.

On January 22, 40 years ago, when the Ukrainian Parliament issued its Fourth Universal—the document that corresponds to the American Declaration of Independence—people the world over recognized another of man's significant attempts to win freedom and liberty.

On the anniversary of that great event all of us will benefit by rededicating ourselves to the cause of freedom. All of us salute the heroic people of the Ukraine, then and now, who hold freedom and self-determination to be man's most important goals.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the independent Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed. We today solemnly commemorate the 40th anniversary of this important chapter in the history of the struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian Nation.

Unfortunately, shortly thereafter the Ukrainian nation succumbed to Bolshevik tyranny. Soviet military power crushed this young republic late in 1920.

Even its churches were destroyed. The people suffered under a horrible Soviet-created famine in 1932–33. Vast purges and deportations were decreed by Moscow.

Nevertheless, the Ukrainian Nation maintains an indestructible hope and passion to be a free and independent sovereign nation.

This nation of over 40 million people is one of our most important allies in the

struggle against Soviet Communist imperialism. The spirit of the Ukrainian people stands as an inspiration to the free peoples of the world in their struggle for worldwide freedom and justice.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an address made by me at the auditorium of the Chopin School in Chicago on January 19, 1958, on the occasion of the observance of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence—January 22—by the United Ukrainian-American organizations of Illinois. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor, a privilege, and a thrilling experience to be here on the 40th anniversary of the independence of a great nation and a proud people.

Today we are making history, you and I, in this tremendous gathering and all the countless thousands at similar gatherings in all the States of our Union.

Today throughout the Free World the voice of Ukraine is being heard and all America is fired by the inspiration of the million and a half of our countrymen and countrywomen of Ukrainian birth or descent.

No better people ever came to cast their lot with us. Our country is a finer land, its qualities of character and its store of achievements enriched, because of the coming to our shores of the sons and daughters of Ukraine. I am proud that in the district that I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States are many in whose veins flow the proud Ukrainian blood. They are foremost in all good works. They are pillars in strengthening the standards in which we believe and which we seek to uphold.

You of Ukrainian birth or descent now in the United States number a million and a half. By your industry, your character, your devotion and your vast contribution in every field of endeavor you have interwoven yourselves into the American fabric and deeply imbedded yourselves in the affection of your neighbors.

HONORING FELLOW AMERICANS

In honoring the Ukrainian day of independence, and the unconquerable spirit of freedom that ever has characterized the people of Ukraine and defied the powers of tyrants, today we honor also our fellow Americans. Yours is the rich heritage of an ancestry that embraced Christianity a thousand years ago, that gave scope to education and culture and vitality and vision to a mighty sovereign nation that reigned before there was a state of Russia. No one is deeper rooted in the age-long struggle of man for the full attainment of human contentment and dignity. It is our great good fortune that you are fellow Americans. Today we honor you and the land from which you came. As Voltaire said in 1763, Ukraine has always aspired to freedom.

It was an honor that deeply touched me to be introduced to this tremendous audience by the Honorable Michael Hinko, a young man of great ability who is destined to exercise an ever broadening influence in

the vital decisions of our country. To Stephen Koropas, the dynamic president of the dedicated organization responsible for this great meeting, and to all who worked so hard with him for its success, I extend my heartfelt thanks. And to John Duzansky, tireless in his good works, I bring from Washington the personal greetings of the Honorable Edward O'Connor, champion of the cause of Ukrainian-Americans in the high counsels of the Federal Government.

I look over this vast audience, and I see many faces, both of men and women, and in them I glimpse, unafraid and unconquerable, the spirit of a great and noble people that in the heel of tyrants find not the weight of crushing power but the challenge to revitalized efforts.

Soon it will come to happen. Soon our world now tormented with the fear of a war that would raze our civilization will be rescued from present torments and restored to the path of peace. It will come surely as tomorrow's sun will dispel the darkness of today's midnight. It will come with the breaking from bondage of Ukraine, the bread basket and the sugar bowl of Russia, the second of the Soviet Republics in population and the source of more than 50 percent of its iron and coal. It is in the hearts of the 40 million people in captive Ukraine that again their land shall be free. Today you and I help in bringing closer the glad day of Ukrainian liberation by what we are doing in our participation in these gatherings in observance of Ukrainian Independence Day.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Today we formally commemorate the 40th anniversary of the birth of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic. This is Ukrainian Independence Day in a very modern sense because it also marks the rebirth of Ukraine as an independent and sovereign nation.

Over 300 years ago Ukraine was not only an independent state but the center of a rich culture and a thriving commerce that linked Europe and Asia. Ukraine first lost its independence to the schemes of empire launched by the czars of Moscow, with the signing of the Treaty of Peregaslav in the spring of 1654. This treaty, which was intended to provide Ukraine with the assistance in maintaining her independence, was used by the Russian Czars to reduce her to a colony of the empire.

For over 260 years Ukraine remained a colony of the old Russian Empire. The ruling caste in Moscow all during these long years exerted extreme efforts to absorb the country into Russia, that is, to make Russians out of the Ukrainians. It is a shining tribute to the strong character of the Ukrainian people and to their heroic spirit that the Russians were defeated in that evil task. The case of Ukraine and its centuries-long struggle for individual liberty and national independence stands today as a symbol of the greatness which becomes a people who refuse to submit to the tyrant's command.

CRACK OF OLD EMPIRES

World War I introduced a new era for the colonial and subjugated nations of the world. As that war was drawing to a close the empires began to crack and fall. There was a great awakening of the people of Europe and Asia to the natural right of all people to self-government and to the need for a world in which all nations were accorded an equal dignity.

President Woodrow Wilson gave real meaning to the aspirations of colonial and subjugated people in his call for national self-determination as a guidepost to rebuilding a war-torn Europe.

From the ruins of empires there sprang up many national republics which attempted to pattern their constitutions and forms of government in the image of the United States. Among these were Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary,

Rumania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkmenistan—all of which are today held captive within the reconstructed Russian Empire.

HIGH POINT OF IDEALISM

That era has often been called, by astute scholars of that period of history, the high point of American idealism in the affairs of nations. At no point since has the great idealism of our Founding Fathers and their inspired Declaration of Independence held such an influence upon the hopes of struggling humanity throughout the world. Just as the certain hand of destiny led us to an unprecedented position in world affairs over 150 years ago, so will it raise us up once again to deliver the oppressed peoples and nations from their exploiters.

ONLY 45 PERCENT RUSSIAN

It seems to me strange that in this age of enlightenment there is so little common knowledge in the United States about the many non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. All too frequently we hear the people of the Soviet Union referred to as Russians and the Soviet Union as Russia. It seems to be uncommon knowledge that Russia is only one of many nations which make up the Soviet Union, and that the Russians comprise only about 45 percent of the populations of the Soviet Union.

On the whole, we know little about the distinctive cultures, languages, traditions, and folklore which characterize the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Yet, we, as leaders of the Free World, are expected to be sensitive to the hopes and aspirations of all the people of the world as we seek to lead the way to peace and tranquility among nations. We suffer from an acute shortage of information about the non-Russian people of the Soviet Union which seriously impairs our leadership of the Free World.

Americans of Ukrainian origin are to be congratulated for all the efforts they have made over the years to reduce this critical deficiency.

EXPERIENCE IN ISRAEL

Just a few weeks ago I visited the new State of Israel, as a member of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. While there I met men and women who had come from all the nations of Europe—some of whom had fled the countries of their birth to escape persecution and death.

Among them was a talented engineer of some 60 years who was born in Ukraine and who took part in the events leading up to the independence of Ukraine in 1918. He escaped during World War II and then took part in the campaign to establish the independent State of Israel. He spoke with feeling about the aspirations of the Ukrainian people to be free and independent and then predicted that as surely as day follows night Ukraine would once again be free and independent. I was inspired by the convictions of this man who had known from personal experience the tyrants' whip and the degradation which befalls the people behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

UKRAINE PLAGUES KREMLIN

The people of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, like the people of the Baltic States and Communist-occupied central Europe, have awakened to the climax of events which are now taking place within the modern-day Russian Empire. The demand for individual liberties and the rights of nations to govern their own affairs rocks that empire to its very foundations.

Ukraine has been in the forefront of this movement, making great sacrifices in her unending struggle to throw off the yoke of the occupier. Because of this hard resistance to all Russian efforts to tame the Ukraine that nation has been the special target of mass deportations, constant purges, and even mass starvation programs.

It seems that the more the Russians persecute and exploit Ukraine the more determined the Ukrainian people become to win back their freedom. This is a fact of life which plagues the rulers in the Kremlin and haunts their proconsuls who are sent to Ukraine to keep that nation in bondage.

RUSSIAN COLONIALISM

All the empires of the 19th century, except one, have passed or are in the process of making the necessary accommodations for self-government of the nations concerned. That exception is the reconstructed and vastly expanded Russian Empire.

We seem to have no hesitancy in calling for the speedup of independent status for the colonial people of Asia and Africa. Moreover, we do not hesitate to call for such action despite the fact that our proven allies such as Britain and France at times become angry at us for doing so.

Yet, when it comes to calling for such action to be applied to the reconstructed Russian Empire we seem suddenly to lose our voice as a nation. Is it because we are ignorant of the facts or because we suffer from a peculiar fixation that somehow the Russians will, like the golden hordes of Ghengis Kahn, fold their tents of occupation and in the silence of the night fall back to their national frontiers? I believe it is a combination of both—and that we must work harder to dispel both these opiates upon long overdue action. You can count on me, as always, to stand with you in this work of peace.

The national independence movements which have started anew behind the Iron Curtain cannot be stopped. The tremendous ground swell of human aspirations which grips that entire area is moving ever forward to a climax—a climax which will, in God's good time, bring an end to the terrible darkness of Russian imperial communism. I join with you in the fervent hope that that happy day will not long be delayed.

Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENSKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. ZELENSKO. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence and established a republic, which was destroyed by the Russian Communists in 1920.

Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, is one of the most resourceful regions of the world. It is now the breadbasket and sugar

bowl of the Soviet Union. In addition to its agricultural production it also stands high throughout the world in its industrial undertakings.

During its long years of subservience Ukraine has continued to struggle for liberation. One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, it has proved to be the Achilles' heel of the Russian Communist empire.

I am honored to pay tribute to these gallant fighters for freedom. I pray that Ukraine may soon shed its yoke of tyranny and again join the free nations of the world.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day for Ukrainians everywhere on which I extend my heartfelt congratulations. It is their independence day, the 40th anniversary of that great event which took place on January 22, 1918, even when part of Ukraine was still under alien rule.

So many world-shaking events have occurred since that time that we are inclined to forget this important event. It is true that many revolutionary and startling events have altered many things in this world, including man's attitude to these events; but man himself has remained remarkably unchanged, and especially so in his appreciation of freedom and in his willingness to fight and die for it. This is well illustrated by the history of the Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian people have endured the oppressive yoke of ruthless Russian regimes, both czarist and Communist, longer than any other people. For more than 300 years they have suffered under Russian tyranny; and unfortunately they are still suffering from it. But through all this hardship and oppression they have steadfastly clung to their national ideals, even at the risk of their lives. In 1918 when they saw their chance of attaining their independence they proclaimed it and set up the Ukrainian Republic. Even though they were to lose this most cherished of their prizes in the fall of 1920 under the onslaught

of the Red army, still they retain its solemn national significance. Its celebration still remains their symbol of freedom and independence.

It is that sadness and hope that we celebrate this memorable day, a day whose full meaning yet awaits fulfillment.

The 40th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 22, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, just 40 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly met and adopted a proclamation establishing an independent Ukraine Republic comprising a nation of some 40 million people. Its independence, however, was shortlived. In 1920 Communist Russia occupied the Ukraine, destroyed the independence of this nation, and enslaved its people to this very day.

Thus, the Ukraine became one of the first victims of aggression by the Kremlin rulers. Since then many millions of Ukrainians have been deported to the slave labor camps and salt mines in Siberia, while those remaining on their ancestral soil have been dealt with ruthlessly.

Notwithstanding all this suffering and long enslavement, the people of the Ukraine continue to strive for freedom and to hope for their liberation from the yoke of communism. In their hopes and struggles to achieve freedom, the eyes of the Ukrainian people are turned primarily toward America for words of encouragement, for expressions of friendship, for signs of sympathetic understanding.

On this occasion of the 40th anniversary of Ukraine Independence, it is most appropriate for the freedom-loving American people to express their solidarity with the people of the Ukraine. To them and their kinsmen in America, who have never forgotten them in their tragic plight during these 4 long decades, we send our greetings and our wishes that their country will soon be liberated and will join the Free World as an independent and democratic nation.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1958

The Very Reverend Father Stephen Hallick-Holutiak, of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States of America, Cleveland, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O heavenly and gracious God, spirit of truth, whose might is ineffable, whose glory is inconceivable, whose mercy is infinite, and whose love toward mankind is unutterable; we praise Thee.

We are living in times of great unrest and tension. Dark and evil forces of

ungodly communism threaten to enslave more and more freedom-loving peoples. Many nations have fallen before the brutal might and violent force of Communist imperialism. First among these nations is Ukraine, who today commemorates the 40th anniversary of the restoration and proclamation of her independence. Only Thou, O God, knowest of the suffering, oppression, slave labor, imprisonment, death by famine of millions of men, women, and children in the Ukraine, and, likewise, those in other countries who have suffered a similar fate.

O great and merciful God, speed the day when all nations shall be free; grant the world true and lasting peace. Strengthen with courage and determination those who seek to do Thy holy will. Grant Thy blessings, O Heavenly Father, to these, Thy servants, who have taken the responsibility of leadership in our Government and in the free world. Give them strong and loving hearts; inspire them to great things in their deliberations. Protect them and guide them by the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, that Thy will be done. May Thy name be forever blessed. Amen.